

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER

KEMP MALONE

JOSÉ ROBLES

HAZELTON SPENCER

CONTENTS

	PAGE
LOTSPEICH, H. G.—Spenser's <i>Urania</i> ,	141
WURTSBAUGH, JEWEL.—Thomas Edwards and the Editorship of the 'Faerie Queene,'	146
HEFFNER, RAY.—The Printing of John Hughes' Edition of Spenser, 1715,	151
STIRLING, BRENTS.—Two Notes on the Philosophy of 'Mutabilitie,'	154
KOLLER, KATHRINE.—Identifications in 'Colin Clout's Come Home Again,'	155
SCHULZE, IVAN L.—Elizabethan Chivalry and the Faerie Queene's Annual Feast,	158
LEMMI, CHARLES W.—Symbolism in 'Faerie Queene,' II. 12,	161
LEMMI, CHARLES W.—The Serpent and the Eagle in Spenser and Shelley,	165
GRUBB, MARION.—A Brace of Villains,	168
GRUBB, MARION.—Kyd's Borrowing from Garnier's 'Bradamante,'	169
ALLEN, DON CAMERON.—Hotspur's Earthquake,	171
McILWRAITH, A. K.—The Printer's Copy for 'The City-Madam,'	173
CAMERON, ALICE.—Desportes and Ariosto: Additional Sources in the 'Orlando' and the 'Liriche,'	174
ROBLES PAZOS, J.—Sobre la Fecha de 'Fuente Ovejuna,'	179
ARNOLD, H. H.—The Most Difficult Passage of 'Don Quijote,'	182

REVIEWS:—

GREENLAW, OSGOOD, PADELFORD (eds.), The Works of Edmund Spenser: The Faerie Queene, Book Two (GREENLAW, HEFFNER, McMANA- WAY, STRATHMANN, eds.), Book Three (PADELFORD, ed.). [H. J. C. Grierson.]	186
F. M. PADELFORD (ed.), The <i>Axiochus</i> of Plato Translated by Edmund Spenser. [Douglas Bush.]	191
B. E. C. DAVIS, Edmund Spenser: A Critical Study. [Ray Heffner.]	192
H. B. LATHROP, Translations from the Classics into English, 1477-1620. [M. Y. Hughes.]	195
H. HARTMAN (ed.), Surrey's Fourth Boke of Virgill; D. C. ALLEN, Francis Meres's Treatise, "Poetrie." [H. B. Lathrop.]	198
E. E. STOLL, Art and Artifice in Shakespeare. [T. M. Parrott.]	200
MARK ECCLES, Christopher Marlowe in London. [Tucker Brooke.]	203
WESSIE M. TIPPING, Jean Regnaud de Segrais. [M. E. Storer.]	204
BRIEF MENTION: A. C. JUDSON, Spenser in Southern Ireland; F. R. JOHNSON, A Critical Bibliography of the Works of Edmund Spenser Printed before 1700; E. K. CHAMBERS, Sir Thomas Wyatt; RUDOLF KIEK (ed.), The City-Madam, by Philip Massinger,	206

BALTIMORE

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

EDITED BY

H. Carrington Lancaster, Gustav Gruenbaum, W. Kurrelmeyer,
Raymond D. Havens, Kemp Malone, H. Spencer, and J. Robles

ADVISORY EDITORS

G. Chinard, E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, R. B. Roulston, L. P. Shanks

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are *not* used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, *not* vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RE.*, *SP.*, *RES.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the *editors* with an indication of the *total* number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

PRIMITIVISM AND THE IDEA OF PROGRESS

IN ENGLISH POPULAR LITERATURE OF THE
EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

(Contributions to the History of Primitivism)

By LOIS WHITNEY

Plentiful as the materials have been, this study is not designed as a compendium of all the popular literature illustrative of primitivism and progressivism of the period covered. Many pertinent documents have been omitted because they have been adequately treated elsewhere, and other material because it is in process of being studied by other scholars. The author has selected from the available material popular documents that are as fresh but at the same time as thoroughly representative as possible, and that tell as clearly as any the story of the gradual degeneration and confusion of these two ideologies. To get a proper perspective on the popular literature, Dr. Whitney has analyzed the net-work of background ideas of primitivism in Chapter I, and of the idea of progress in Chapters V and VI. She has tried to determine what aspects of the various schools of thought of the century lent themselves to the former point of view and what to the latter, and what were the probable sources of confusion between the two ways of thinking.

364 pages, 8vo, cloth, \$2.75

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS · BALTIMORE

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894

Modern Language Notes

Volume L

MARCH, 1935

Number 3

SPENSER'S URANIA

In *The Teares of the Muses*, the speech of each Muse embodies Spenser's conception of her particular function. The speech of Urania (lines 481-540) presents an interesting problem, for in it her classical character as Muse of Astronomy is overlaid with alien, non-classical elements. Urania begins, like several of her sisters, by bemoaning man's present "love of blindness and of ignorance" because of which he wanders "in error and in doubt, open to the dangers of "fleshes frailtie and deceit of sin." Only "the heavenlie light of knowledge" can raise him out of the mire and give him guidance and strength and grace. Then she proceeds to tell the nature of the knowledge which she can give. Through her gift man may learn of the world's creation, how Nature formed things out of a formless mass. He may also come to know himself and his duties to man and to God. From the sphere of mundane things he may "mount aloft unto the skie" and behold the hierarchy of the heavens, the stars and the movement of the spheres, and

The Spirites and Intelligences fayre,
And Angels waighting on th'Almighties chayre.

And there, with humble minde and high insight,
Th'eternall Makers majestie wee viewe,
His love, his truth, his glorie, and his might,
And mercie more than mortall men can vew.
O soveraigne Lord, O soveraigne happinesse,
To see thee, and thy mercie measurelesse!

Such happiness have they that doo embrace
The precepts of my heavenlie discipline;
But shame and sorrow and accursed case
Have they that scorne the schoole of arts divine,
And banish me, which do professe the skill
To make men heavenly wise through humbled will.

Urania, then, is the patroness of a good deal more than Astronomy. Four lines are devoted to her classical character; the next fourteen make her appear as the Muse of Christian theology, the power through which we achieve the Beatific Vision and become morally and religiously regenerated.

Commenting on the speech as a whole, Professor Renwick says, "Here Spenser summarizes rapidly the content of philosophical studies, forgetting for a moment the Muse of Astronomy in his pleased recollection of the Bible, Cicero, Christian theology, natural philosophy, and ethics."¹ The question is: is Spenser forgetting the Muse or is he keeping her well in mind? Is there justification in the traditional interpretations of Urania for his making her speak as she does?

There was in classical times no fixed division of the functions of the Muses nor any regular correspondence between their names and their natures.² Hesiod³ speaks of them as a group and only names Urania as one of the nine. Ausonius was apparently the first to set down in neat mnemonic arrangement the functions of each of the nine, in lines which were attributed to Vergil in most sixteenth-century editions of his works and which Spenser certainly knew. In these lines, Urania "poli motus scrutatur et astra." Plutarch is voicing the classical conception when he says, "We suppose that there is but one of the Muses who presides in heaven and over heavenly things, and she is Urania."⁴

Among the mythographers there were several interpretations of Urania's nature. Those of Diodorus Siculus⁵ and Fulgentius⁶ are somewhat eccentric and need not detain us. More to the purpose is the tradition found in Macrobius, Lilius Gyraldus, Natalis Comes, and others, to the effect that the Muses are really the Intelligences of the nine spheres, and that Urania is placed eighth and is so named because she is the spirit of the heaven of the fixed stars.⁷

¹ W. L. Renwick, ed., *Complaints*, p. 215.

² Cf. W. H. Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexikon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie*, art. "Musen."

³ *Theogony*, 1-84.

⁴ *Quaest. Conviv.*, IX, 14.

⁵ *Bibliotheca Historica*, IV, 7.

⁶ *Mitologiarum Libri*, I, 48.

⁷ Macrobius, *In Somn. Scipionis*, II, 3: "Theologi quoque novem musas, octe sphaerarum musicos cantus et unam maximam concinentiam quae consit

Although such a tradition does not directly explain Spenser's Urania, it does perhaps afford a step in the association of astronomy with theology.

Much more, however, could be made of Urania's name, and was. Two sixteenth-century mythographers whom Spenser may have known present an interpretation which comes closer to his conception. Lilius Gyraldus and Geoffroi Linocier say, in almost the same words, that Urania is so named "because she raises to heaven men who are learned and studious of her, or because glory and wisdom raise souls to celestial contemplation."⁸ It is easy to see how this notion might lead to Spenser's idea of Urania. "Celestial contemplation" is substantially what he is talking about. But "celestial" carries several meanings; and while the writers cited thus far provide some of the elements in Spenser's Urania, the definitely religious element which we found to be the most important in Spenser is not found in any of them.

There are two bits of external evidence which lead one to turn to the French Huguenot poet DuBartas in this connection. Gabriel Harvey, in one of his marginalia, said that Spenser took special delight in the Fourth Day of the First Week of DuBartas, "which he esteems as the proper profession of Urania."⁹ In the Envoy to *The Ruines of Rome*, after paying his respects to DuBellay, Spenser says,

ex omnibus esse voluere. Unde Hesiodus in theogonia sua octavam musam Uraniam vocat: quia post septem vagas, quae subjectae sunt, octava stellifera sphaera superposita proprio nomine coelum vocatur. . . ." Practically the same words are found in Lilius Gyraldus, *De Musis Syntagma, Opera Omnia*, pp. 564-5. The same is in Natalis Comes, *Mythologiae*, vii, 15. A later appearance of the tradition is in George Sandys, *Ovid's Metamorphosis Englished, Mythologized*, Oxford, 1632.

⁸ Geoffroi Linocier, *Mythologia Musarum*, cap. ix (appended to the 1583 and later editions of Natalis Comes). The same words are found in Gyraldus, *op. cit.*, pp. 564-5.

⁹ I. Gollancz, *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 1907, pp. 99-105, found prefixed to Gabriel Harvey's collection of travel books the following note: "It is not sufficient for poets to be superficial humanists; but they must be exquisite artists, and curious universal scholars; Mr. Digges hath the whole of the Aquarius of Palingenius by heart, and takes delight to repeat it often. Mr. Spenser conceives the like pleasure in the fourth day of the first Week of Bartas which he esteems as the proper profession of Urania."

And after thee, gins *Bartas* hie to rayse
His heavenly Muse, th'Almightie to adore.

If we turn to the Fourth Day of the First Week to see what "the proper profession of *Urania*" is, we find substantially the same subject matter as that of the passage in *The Teares of the Muses*. The whole book, of course, deals with the creation of the world; we remember that Spenser's *Urania* teaches of "the world's creation." This particular section deals with the creation of the heavens and the heavenly bodies. The zodiac and the seven planets are fully described. Near the end we find the same transition from knowledge of Astronomy to knowledge of God. All these things, DuBartas says, are controlled not by the Stoic's Destiny, but by God and in them is His Providence.

Therefore (the rather) we below
Should study all, their Course and Force to know
To th'end that . . .
We might unpuff our heart and bend our knee
T'appease with sighs God's wrathfull Majestie.¹⁰

Worship and knowledge of God through a study of his works is a theme common enough in poetry as in theology. It is a part of the general tradition of Christian mysticism and is found in such various disciplines as Calvinism and Neo-Platonism. Spenser's best expression of the theme is in the *Hymne of Heavenly Beautie*, lines 22-105. There is no special significance to our argument in its appearance in its appearance in DuBartas and in Spenser. There is significance, however, in the fact that Spenser considered this theme, as treated by DuBartas, to be "the proper profession of *Urania*."

DuBartas' *Urania*, to which Spenser is probably alluding in *The Ruines of Rome*, illustrates further this conception of the Muse. In it he says that, after he had tried his hand at various secular kinds of poetry, *Urania* appeared to him.

I am *Urania* (then aloud, said shee)
Who humane kinde above the Poles transporte
Teaching their hands to touch and eyes to see
All th'entercourse of the Celestiall Court.¹¹

¹⁰ Since the argument does not depend on verbal parallels we have used Sylvester's translation of DuBartas, ed. Grosart, I, lines 522-7.

¹¹ Sylvester's translation, ed. Grosart, I, 3-7.

She bids him follow her and

Soar up to Heav'n: Sing me th'almighties praise.

The other Muses deal in madrigals and now are "made Bawds to Lovers."¹² All our holy songs are profaned and

Men's eyes are sield-up with Cimmerian mist.¹³

Although men now "wallow in foule delights"¹⁴ and pervert the Muses to base purposes, poetry originally sang the highest mysteries. So sang David and Moses, who were inspired by me.¹⁵ She ends by urging the poet to take as his theme "His high praise who makes the Heavens goe round."

We saw that in the interpretations of the mythographers some of the elements in Spenser's conception of Urania are implicit. She is the "heavenly" Muse who leads men to study of the stars and to "celestial contemplation." But the definitely religious element is explicit only in DuBartas. Given Harvey's note and Spenser's allusion in *The Ruines of Rome*, and given the fact that substantially the same conception of Urania is to be found in both poets, it becomes fairly probable that a relationship exists. It seems reasonable to say that Spenser was not "forgetting the Muse" when he made Urania speak in *The Teares of the Muses*, but that he had a fairly definite conception of her as the Spirit who leads men through the study of the works of nature to the contemplation of the Heavenly Hierarchy and of God himself, and that, in so regarding her, he was largely indebted to the leading religious poet of contemporary France.

Such a conception of Urania naturally calls to mind the "Heavenly Muse" of Milton. It is not our purpose here to argue for a definite influence of Spenser and DuBartas on Milton's Muse. However, in view of the fact that Milton read and pondered both of them, one suggestion may be made by way of conclusion. In the invocation to Urania which opens Book VII of *Paradise Lost*, Milton shows that he is well aware of the difference between the pagan Muse, "an empty dreame," and his own heavenly guide. We have seen that in Spenser and DuBartas the pagan Muse had be-

¹² Cf. *Teares of the Muses*, 379-384, 412-4.

¹³ Cf. *Teares of the Muses*, 253 ff.

¹⁴ Cf. *Teares of the Muses*, 481-498.

¹⁵ Cf. *Paradise Lost*, I, 6-12, and see the last paragraph below.

come the patroness of Christian mystical contemplation. It does not seem improbable that when Milton took Urania as the Muse of his Christian epic and called her the inspirer of Moses and David himself, he was helped in his Christianizing of a pagan myth by what he found in the two earlier poets.

H. G. LOTSPEICH

Princeton University

[The proof of this article was corrected by the author on the day before he died in November. The Editors of MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES would express their sorrow over the loss of one who to the end showed such courageous devotion to scholarship.—THE EDITORS.]

THOMAS EDWARDS AND THE EDITORSHIP OF THE *FAERIE QUEENE*

Upton refers to *The Faerie Queene* published in 1751 as "Mr. Kent's edition" which "Mr. Birch . . . printed."¹ Walpole reports Kent's drawings for it were "a very favourite work" of the artist, "exceedingly cried up by his admirers" but "in proportion" disappointing to the public.² Kent died, however, in 1748. Thereafter Brindley, the bookseller, promoted the work. In the proposals, July 1, 1751, in the newspaper advertisements, and on the title-page of the edition no name appeared save that of Kent though both the "new life" of Spenser and the glossary were mentioned. Letters of Thomas Edwards suggest that Edwards was among those whom Brindley solicited for editorial assistance. On March 9, 1750, the prospective editor wrote Daniel Wray that he would be "very glad to see and willing to contribute" what he could towards "a good edition" of Spenser though he had no "great opinion of the undertaker." He considered the possibility in some detail: the first quarto, the first folio, and Hughes' edition should be collated to insure a correct text; the "old" orthography observed save where the same word was spelled differently "as by accident"; and "the glossary, parallel places and everything else" omitted unless printed later in a "supplemental volume" together with "the rest of Spenser's works." Edwards had not entirely

¹ *The Faerie Queene*, ed. Upton, II, 596.

² *Anecdotes of Painting in England*, ed. 1782, IV, 241.

acquiesced however; for he dreaded the tedious business of "correcting the press." The fact that the six stanzas of "the specimen" had been printed with ninety-five lections varying from the quarto made him no less reluctant. Moreover he was dubious as to how his "bent" was to be communicated to Brindley. But whatever his decision, he did not intend to give the promoter his "pains." He wished Wray to "make a bargain" for him if he undertook the work.³

Edwards' admiration for Spenser was well-known among his friends. Samuel Richardson after inveighing against Newton's edition of *Paradise Lost* exclaimed to him, "Your Spenser too, they tell me!"⁴ Edwards replied that having looked over the proposals for Brindley's version he feared "poor Spenser" would be "even worse treated than either Milton or Spenser." In a "picture-loving" age—a hit at what Walpole called Kent's "most execrable performance"⁵—he saw no end to the "scandalous injuries" being done to English "classic" authors till they were rescued from the booksellers, who instead of waiting till they could get a good edition "procure a competency of cuts, publish proposals, levy subscriptions, and then beat about for an undertaker, no matter whom the cheaper the better."⁶ But if Spenser were "murdered," Edwards himself would not leave the poet "unrevenged." On April 5⁷ he was still doubtful as to how he was to undertake his work, whether to beg subscriptions or let himself out as a hackney to Brindley "at so much a sheet" while Brindley made a "little fortune" by his labors. The "exclusive right" the booksellers claimed to English "classic" poets made it impossible to publish without their assistance, which they so exerted that if one author did not come down to their price, they would find another who would. Such was Brindley's method, for by April 12⁸ Edwards had learned that Dr. Thomas Birch had agreed to supervise the 1751 *Faerie Queene*.⁹ Though he did not question

³ *Thomas Edwards' Letters*, Bodl. MS. 1011.

⁴ *Ibid.*, letter dated March 19, 1750-1.

⁵ *Letters of Horace Walpole*, ed. Cunningham (1857), II, 257.

⁶ *Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*, ed. A. L. Barbauld, III, 11-18.

⁷ *Letter to the Honorable Philip Yorke*, dated April 5, 1751, Bodl. MS. 1011.

⁸ Letter to Daniel Wray, dated April 12, 1751, Bodl. MS. 1011.

⁹ Since his earlier letter to Wray, Edwards had more carefully con-

his "friend Birches care and attention," Edwards doubted his "itability" in Spenser owing to his preoccupation with "more important matters."¹⁰ He thought he could prepare a "good" text himself "by the next spring." Hence on May 5, he wrote to Wray that he had been "wholly taken up by Spenser," and that "so much as frequently tired his eyes."¹¹ He was not without concern for Brindley's "folly," however, for he feared this edition would hinder "a complete one's being put out" since probably the few who read Spenser would "furnish themselves with this Picture book," eliminating "farther demand."

He was still "hard at work upon Spenser" when he wrote Richardson¹² but to no avail save his "own private satisfaction" for he and Brindley had failed to agree owing to the latter's haste. "Wilfull will do't, that's his crest," Edwards quoted in exasperation, which was quite true for when Richardson wrote next,¹³ Brindley was about to advertise. The novelist, eager to save "that divine author" from "the vampplot," urged Edwards to precede him in notification, and thereafter execute "a new edition" of "his Spenser" such as might be "the standard . . . and so go down" with his name to "future times." But even now another issue was in the offing for Richardson included in his message a

sidered the notes, for he remarks in his letter that it "will be a hard matter to steer between too little and too much," many things in Spenser being "plain" to those, "who are conversant with the authors of that age, and with romantic history, which will be Greece to those who are only read in the moderns," a criticism as to Spenser's "romanticisms" before Warton's *Observations* (1754) or Upton's edition (1758), which particularly emphasized this feature of the poem.

¹⁰ A letter from Warburton to Birch (May 27, 1738) points to there having been more than one projected edition of Spenser at the turn of the half-century and to Birch's interest in the poet: "I was desired by the Master of Peterhouse [John Whalley], who is about to publish Spenser, to enquire whether Fenton, who published Waller and he hears had an intention of publishing Spenser, left any papers on that subject behind him, and how they are to be procured if he did. I take the liberty of applying to you, as the properest person to give me information" (John Nichols, *Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century*, II, 87-88).

¹¹ Letter to Wray, dated May 5, 1751, *Bodl. MS. 1011*.

¹² Letter dated May 8, 1751, *Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*, II, 19-24.

¹³ May 27, 1751. *Richardson MS.*, Forster Collection, Victoria and Albert Museum, London.

copy of *A Letter Concerning A New Edition of Spenser's Faerie Queene*, "from the author," John Upton. Hence on June 8, Edwards wrote to Yorke that "in this affair of Spenser," they seemed to be playing at "the Parson has lost his fuddling cap," for the latter "would charge" him with it, he "would throw it off on Mr. West," and "Mr. West as it should seem on Mr. Upton," which last Edwards thought would do if West "oversaw" the work and corrected "the impetuosity" of Upton.¹⁴

It seems evident that Edwards really wanted to edit Spenser, and would have if he could have made a satisfactory arrangement with an undertaker and been able to drive himself to the laborious duties of an editor. He found it easier to attack criticism than to originate it. Witness his *Canons of Criticism*. But whatever he actually thought, Edwards was still interested in the edition for on June 10, he urged Arthur Onslow to prevail upon West to aid Upton that "a tolerably correct" edition might be secured.¹⁵ He "longed" to see Brindley's work but thought "he must have made more haste than good speed to get it ready . . . so soon." By June 19¹⁶ he had not only seen Upton's *Letter to West* but from what he had heard "passed the other day between" Upton and "Mr. Brindley's man," Birch, of course, he thought it "plain" Upton was about an edition which he again surmised would be "a good one" if overseen by West. He accepted kindly Richardson's "exhortations . . . in regard to Spenser" but he was discouraged. Others were "forwarder" in the work than he; "some persons or other" claimed a right to the copy, necessitating the collaboration of "the vampers," to Edwards, the real fly in the ointment. He would "consider" the matter "further" though he would not be willing to advertise till he was ready to publish "lest any dislike to the work, or other accident" should make him worse than his word! In an undated letter to Daniel Wray,¹⁷ he thanked the latter for "refusing Mr. Brindley's offer" in his name for he "ought not to accept such a present from a stranger" particularly since he could have only one reason for making it, and that, one which pleaded strongly against Edwards' accepting it. Obviously, Brindley was angling for the critic's assistance.

¹⁴ Letter dated June 8, 1751, *Bodl. MS. 1011*.

¹⁵ Letter dated June 10, *Bodl. MS. 1011*.

¹⁶ *Letter to Richardson, Correspondence of Samuel Richardson*, III, 24-26.

¹⁷ Undated but following the letter to Richardson, *Bodl. MS. 1011*.

On August 13, Edwards' "longing" was in part satisfied. He had seen the first volume of the 1751 *Faerie Queene*.¹⁸ Although he could not say much "for the cuts either in respect of the designs or the execution," by "Mr. Birch's diligence" the text would be "more correct" than that of any other, which was quite true for Birch was the first editor to collate the earlier versions. By August 23 he had gone through "the edition" as well as he could without having the "old" one to compare and had found most of the errors chargeable to the "ignorance and negligence" of the printers.¹⁹ He had also seen and disapproved of Upton's "specimen," which he doubted Upton could get two hundred subscribers for.²⁰ Three days later he again commended the "pains" Birch had taken, adjudging his the "best edition . . . yet published," and adequate to "supersede the necessity of another."²¹ Brindley's angling or friendship for Birch had led to Edwards' having a small share in the edition. He thanked Birch on October the first for his "Spenser," which after he had "found advertised for a short time," he had worked at "as hard" as he could to "send . . . the Errata as soon as possible."²² His minor participation in the edition perhaps prejudiced his later opinion.

The London Daily Advertiser and Literary Gazette announced the proposals for Upton's edition on July 26, 1751, whereupon Richardson wrote Edwards²³ that people were "sorry" Upton had undertaken "your Spenser." He enclosed "a specimen and proposal . . . printed with the concurrence of the Tonsons," whose property the work "was supposed to be."²⁴

Edwards' correspondence reveals nothing more of his interest in Spenser till he wrote the Rev. Mr. Lawry²⁵ that he had seen Newton's second volume of Milton²⁶ and agreed with him that

¹⁸ Letter to Arthur Onslow dated Aug. 13, 1751, *Bodl. MS. 1011*.

¹⁹ Letter to Daniel Wray, dated Aug. 23, 1751, *Bodl. MS. 1011*.

²⁰ Upton advertised for three hundred. See the *Whitehall Evening-Post* for July 27-30.

²¹ Letter to Richardson, dated Aug. 26, 1751, *Bodl. MS. 1011*.

²² *Brit. Mus. MS. Sloane 4305*.

²³ Letter dated July 27, 1751, *Richardson MS.*, Forster Collection.

²⁴ Fair proof that the Tonsons had secured the right to it before they published their octavo (1758). See "The 1758 Editions of the *Faerie Queene*," *MLN.*, April 1933, 229.

²⁵ March 27, 1753, *Bodl. MS. 1012*.

²⁶ *Paradise Regained*, ed. 1752.

Thyer was the "best qualified" to edit Spenser "of all those" who had given any "specimen of their critical capacity." Yet, he was curious as to Upton's progress, for he asked, "How does your Brother Prebendary go on with his work?" He apprehended the public would be "overrun with editions of Spenser" for "Simpson too" was "about publishing him."²⁷ Nevertheless on April 23 (1753), he urged Arthur Onslow²⁸ to promote an edition by Thyer as an undertaking suitable to his character as the "patron of the Learned." But neither Simpson's nor Thyer's *Faerie Queene* appeared, and Upton's was long in coming. That was all. Edwards died four years later (1757), having contributed only to the correction of the text in the 1751 edition. Failure to make a satisfactory arrangement with a publisher and distaste for the tedious business of an editor had inhibited his own edition.

JEWEL WURTSBAUGH

The University of Oklahoma

THE PRINTING OF JOHN HUGHES' EDITION OF SPENSER, 1715

In 1715 was published the first scholarly edition of Spenser's works, edited by John Hughes and printed for Jacob Tonson, in six volumes, 12mo. It was issued in two sizes, one on large (royal) paper and one on small paper;¹ the large paper copies were issued to subscribers, a list of whose names was printed in the first volume. This list follows immediately after the dedication and begins a new signature, *a-[*a5v].² The absence of the list from *H*_{1b} is not

²⁷ Simpson had previously edited Beaumont and Fletcher. Newton refers to his anticipated Spenser (*Paradise Regained*, A₂ verso).

²⁸ *Bodl. MS. 1012*.

¹ Hereafter referred to as *H*_{1a} and *H*_{1b} respectively. I use the copies in the Tudor and Stuart Club of the Johns Hopkins University.

² The pagination is (ix)—xviii. The list accounts for two hundred and fifteen sets and contains the names of many notables of the period, including Addison, Blackmore, Sir Godfrey Kneller, Peter Motteux, Matthew Prior, "Mr. Phillips," Pope, "Horatio Walpole, jun. Esq.," Richard West, many of the nobility, and descendants of persons mentioned in Spenser's dedicatory sonnets and other poems.

noticeable, because of the separate signature and of the new pagination at the beginning of the next section. A comparison of the remainder of the preliminary material³ shows that it is identical in the two sizes and printed from the same type. The text, however, beginning with "A Letter of the Authors" and continuing through a part of the *Faerie Queene*, is not from the same setting. Throughout the remainder of Volumes I and II, and to page 592, [Cc12v], in Volume III the initial letters, headpieces, tailpieces, other ornaments, swash letters, and the like are all different, indicating, obviously, a re-setting of the type. From page 593 (Dd) in Volume III to the end of Volume VI the pages are identical and from the same setting of type.

In the first volumes there are, in addition to the differences in type, many variations in readings. The following are the variants for Book I of the *Faerie Queene*, made up from the list of readings in the table of variants in the first volume of the *Variorum Spenser*:

Page in Hughes	<i>Faerie Queene</i> I	Variorum reading	Large paper	Small paper
94	6. xxiv. 5	teare	tear	rear
95	6. xxx. 9	lore	Lore	Love
97	6. xxxviii. 2	shall I	shall I	I shall
104	7. xii. 3	him did	him did	did him
109	7. xxxv. 1	No	No	Ne
116	8. v. 6	bowre	Bower	Bowers
123	8. xxxiii. 1	asked	asked	added
125	8. xliii. 7	whom	whom	when
128	9. Arg. 1	<i>loues</i>	<i>Loves</i>	<i>Love</i>
131	9. xiv. 4	iust	just	a just
163	11. xiii. 2	enraunged	enranged	enraged
165	11. xxiii. 1	His	His	The ⁴

³ Collation: Frontispiece; [A1], Title; A2-[A4v], Dedication; *a-[*a5], Subscribers to the Royal Paper of Spenser's Works [large paper only]; a-[a11v], The Life of Mr. Edmund Spenser; Illustration; [a12], Subtitle: An Essay on Allegorical Poetry with Remarks on the Writings of Mr. Edmund Spenser; b-[e9], Essay and Remarks; [e10]-[f12²], A Glossary. (Two sheets of this last gathering were used for the "Advertisement" and Rejected Stanzas inserted in the end of Volume III. In our small paper copy these sheets remain with the Glossary in Vol. I, the printer having failed to cut them off. The gathering is folded as is usual for a 12mo without cutting [cf. McKerrow, *Introduction to Bibliography*, pp. 169-172], with resulting confusion to the pagination and order of the sheets.) The text begins with signature B and page 1.

⁴ I did not have the opportunity to examine both these copies until

It will be seen from the table above that in every case H_{1a} has the correct reading and H_{1b} a careless printer's error. H_{1b} gives every evidence of having been set up hurriedly and printed without proof-reading. The explanation seems to be that the 1715 edition was first designed for subscribers only and that after enough copies of the first volumes to supply the subscribers were run off, the type for a part was distributed. It was then decided to issue a trade edition on smaller paper. The distributed type had to be re-set hurriedly, and no opportunity was given for proof reading. The custom of the time was to issue such a work in an edition for subscribers, and it is unthinkable that Hughes would solicit subscribers to a large paper edition of a work already in progress in a less handsome format. I conclude, therefore, that H_{1b} represents a hurried re-setting from H_{1a} .⁵ The necessity for enlarging the edition indicates an unsuspected interest in Spenser in the first quarter of the Eighteenth Century.

RAY HEFFNER

The Johns Hopkins University

Volumes I and II of the *Variorum* were already in print, but I have included the variants between the two printings of Hughes in Volume III. In a forthcoming Volume (Book VI) the reading for Books I and II will be listed in the errata. Mr. Douglas Hamer lists in his review of Book I (*RES.*, x, 220) most of the above variants as errors on the part of the editors. The truth of the matter is that Professor Padelford was using a small paper copy and Mr. Hamer was checking his readings in a large paper copy. Mr. Hamer, unconscious of the two printings, was somewhat confused—and a little alarmed—by the "errors."

⁵ One might argue that the reverse is true, that H_{1a} represents a correction of H_{1b} . One reading would support such a view; in Volume III, p. 367 (*F. Q.*, III, i, arg. 3), the H_{1a} reads correctly "Malecasta's" and the H_{1b} , following the quartos and folios, reads incorrectly "Materasta's." It might seem here that in preparing H_{1a} the compositor, or proof reader, noticed the correct spelling of the word further on in the text and corrected it. (It is hardly possible that he referred to the "Faults Escaped" in the 1590 edition, where the error is corrected, for there is no other indication of any use of the 1590 quarto or of "F. E.") It is more likely, I think, that H_{1b} was set from an uncorrected proof and therefore retained an error which had been corrected in the first setting. This error is also retained in the 1750 reprint. In fact, the presence of most of the careless errors of H_{1b} in the 1750 reprint indicated that the latter was set from the former. The basic text for the 1715 edition was the 1609 folio. The 1750 reprint frequently goes back to the 1590 quarto for a reading, but the 1715 editor seems never to have gone behind the folio.

TWO NOTES ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF *MUTABILITIE*

In a recent article¹ I sought to demonstrate the relationship between Arthur Golding's translation of the *Metamorphoses* and Spenser's Garden of Adonis episode. Several pertinent verbal parallels were there presented which create a presumption that Spenser relied upon Golding to an extent not inconsiderable, when the poet's usual transformation of his sources is kept in mind. It is not surprising, therefore, that evidence of verbal borrowing from Golding is present in Spenser's other treatise on permanence and flux, the *Cantos of Mutabilitie*.

Spenser, in 7. 7. 25, gives us a compact description of the four elements in transmutation. In a passage equally concise (xv, 270), Golding treats the same problem. Spenser writes that the elements change, one into the other, "The Fire to Ayre, and the Ayre to Water sheere," Golding that "the earth resolving leysurely dooth melt to water sheere."² This parallel could, of course, be a coincidence, but in view of Spenser's use of Golding in the Garden of Adonis, and the fact that *Mutabilitie* is filled with Ovidian pagantry, direct borrowing or verbal exactness of memory is rendered probable. If so, there is evident one more case of Spenser's use of Golding as a philosophical and scientific reference book.

A second matter for consideration here is an observation intended to supplement my article on the philosophical doctrine of the Mutability Cantos.³ The concluding stanzas of the Mutability fragment state: first, that things conquer change by "turning to themselves at length againe," and reaching perfection by fate; secondly, that victory over change is attainable through amalgamation with the "Sabbaoth God." I sought to show that these two concepts are Boethian and therefore part of English Renaissance tradition, and that they supplement each other instead of being at variance as some had supposed. I desire, however, to make the Boethian

¹ "The Philosophy of Spenser's Garden of Adonis," *PMLA*, XLIX (1934), 501.

² The fact that Golding has earth changing to "water sheere," while Spenser has air doing so is easily explainable, for in Golding both these changes occur; the process is described first in forward and then in reverse order, according to the usual doctrine of the four elements. *Italics mine.*

³ "The Concluding Stanzas of *Mutabilitie*," *SP.*, xxx (1933), 193.

interpretation clearer by pointing out that the concept of things conquering change and achieving perfection by returning "to themselves," and that of change being transcended upon union with God, can be considered as one and the same philosophical doctrine. The Neo-Platonists viewed all creation as a series of "emanations" from God, at once the source and goal to which all being strove to return. The more remote the emanation the less the perfection of being; the nearer the return to the Source, the greater the perfection.⁴ Hence, Spenser's doctrine that things achieve perfection and immutability by turning to themselves, may be interpreted as a declaration of the same concept he presents three stanzas later, namely that perfection and immutability are attained upon union with the Sabbaoth God. Such an interpretation remains Boethian inasmuch as the two aforementioned doctrines are merged in the *De Consolatione*, Book IV, Prose 6, which I adduced as an analogue of Spenser's conclusion.⁵

BRENTS STIRLING

University of Washington

IDENTIFICATIONS IN COLIN CLOUT'S COME HOME AGAINE

In the copy of Spenser's *Colin Clout's Come Home Againe* (1595) now in the possession of Mr. Gabriel Weils of New York City, are some interesting notes written in a seventeenth-century hand.¹ Although the exact date of these notes can not be deter-

⁴ Ficino, for example, puts the doctrine thus: "Of course, that supreme Author creates things one by one at first, hastens them away in the second place, perfects them in the third place. Also, in the beginning all things flow out from that perennial fountain when they are produced; then, they flow back into the same when they return again to their very origin. In the last place they are perfected after they return to their own origin." (*Com. in Con. Plat.*, II, 1. Transl. Sister Mary Ethelind, Univ. of Wash. Thesis, 1930.)

⁵ Another expression of the notion is found at the end of III meter 2 and the beginning of III prose 3. See also III prose 10.

¹ I am indebted to Mr. Wells for his kindness in permitting me to examine this volume. The book came from the Robert Hoe collection and was at one time in the libraries of G. Walter Steeves and Jerome Kern.

mined, a reference to the 1605 edition of Sylvester's translation of Du Bartas indicates that they are later than that date. At the close of the letter to Raleigh (A₂v) the annotator has copied these lines:

our mysterious Elfine Oracle.
deepe, morall grave invencions miracle/

Below the ornament he identifies the quotation by the comment: "Josuah Silvester in his translacion of Dubartas works pa 272/." The quotation from Sylvester is repeated on the title page of *Astrophel* with the statement: "This was made by Josuah Silvester of Edmund Spenser." The quotation occurs in the opening passage of the *First Parte of the First Day of the Second Weeke of the Divine Weekes and Works* and is found on page 272 only in the 1605 edition.² Although it is impossible to do more than set 1605 as a *terminus a quo* for these notes, the handwriting would indicate a date not later than the middle of the seventeenth century when the secretarial hand was still in use.

The most interesting of these notes are those which identify certain characters in *Colin Clout*. The "scornfull lass" (l. 419) is "delia." Urania is "Ye Countess of Pembroke"; Theana is "Ye Countess of Warwick"; and Mansilia is "Ye Marchioness of Northampton." These identifications are in accord with the findings of later scholars. The sister of Theana, however, "Faire Marion the Muses only darling," who is usually said to be Margaret, Countess of Cumberland, sister of Anne, Countess of Warwick, is identified here as "Ye Countess of Huntington." This is not such an unlikely identification, since the Countess of Huntington was Catherine Dudley, sister of Ambrose Dudley, Earl of Warwick, and thus sister-in-law to Theana. "Phyllis, Charyllis and sweet Amaryllis" are identified in the margin as:

"Ye Countess of Derby
Ye Lady Compton and Montegle
Ye Lady Hunsdon."

The fact that opposite Amaryllis (line 564) the annotator wrote "Ye Countess dowager of Derby widow unto Ferdinando late Earl of Derby" may give some clue to the order in reading the others. If Amaryllis is Countess of Derby, then Charillis is Lady Compton

²I am indebted to Dr. Louis B. Wright, who checked the editions of Sylvester in the Henry E. Huntington Library.

and Phyllis, Lady Hunsdon. The annotator follows tradition in calling Stella "Ye Lady Riche" in *Colin Clout* and also in *Astrophel* (lines 36, 55). This inaccuracy, for by Stella Spenser surely meant Lady Essex, shows the popularity of this tradition in the seventeenth century.

When he calls Amyntas "Sir Philip Sidney," he probably read the poem carelessly. Although Amintas in the *Faerie Queene*, III. vi. 45 is Sidney, Amyntas in *Colin Clout* is the Earl of Derby. The annotator, however, was interested in the Sidneys, for in *Astrophel* he identifies Clorinda as "Ye Countess of Pembroke" and writes "Mary Pembroke" at the bottom of G2v. Ignoring the other elegies, he makes a few notes on *An Epitaph on the Right Honourable sir Philip Sidney*. He identifies the king for whom Sidney is named (line 17) as "Phillip the 2 kinge of Spayne," and Sidney's Kentish home (line 21) as "Penshurst." Below this note he adds, "Penshurst was sometime the house of Sir Raphe Vane knight."³

The commentator marked certain passages in *Colin Clout* and *Astrophel* by overlining them or by using quotation marks in the left margin. The names of all the poets and unidentified ladies are overlined; and not only is the passage on Alabaster (lines 400-415) overlined but lines 407-409 are also marked by quotes. These lines urge Elizabeth to encourage him to complete his poem in her honor. The overlined passages are: lines 465-479; 659-683; 688-730 (703-713 marked by quotes); 757-762; and 771-782. These are all well known passages which treat of Spenser's devotion to "a Mayd," his realization of the court as unsuitable for a poet, and his bitter satire on the servile, flattering courtiers who degrade the noblest ideals of love. The lines from *Astrophel*, 23-24, 36, 89-90 and 49 (*L. of C.*), are in praise of Sidney and Stella, or are seventeenth-century commonplaces.⁴

A summary of these manuscript notes brings out the following points: (1) there is an authenticated Spenser allusion in Sylvester's work; (2) we have the earliest record of identifications of people mentioned in *Colin Clout*, a record dating somewhere between

³ Penshurst became the property of Sir William Sidney in 1552 after Sir Ralph Vane (Fane) was executed for treason.

⁴ Lines 471-2 in *CCCHA*. receive the obvious explanation in the margin, "Me[m]Jo of ye Request" and "doctor of Phishike."

1605 and the middle of the century; (3) with two exceptions these identifications tally with the discoveries of recent scholars; (4) the comments on *Astrophel* denote the continued interest in the Sidneys and the strength of the Stella-Lady Riche tradition; (5) the marked passages on the court, on Spenser, and the adumbrated personages indicate the popularity of these topics long after Spenser's own time.

KATHRINE KOLLER

Bryn Mawr College

ELIZABETHAN CHIVALRY AND THE FAERIE QUEENE'S ANNUAL FEAST

Spenser's use of the Faerie Queene's annual twelve days' feast to motivate the action of his great poem has commonly been regarded as nothing more than the conventional story frame as it was employed by Boccaccio and Chaucer. But as I have shown elsewhere,¹ Elizabethan chivalry has an important place in *The Faerie Queene*, and Spenser's employment of the feast may well be a reflection of certain chivalric practices of the age rather than a mere reversion to the feast of the romances. This is all the more likely when one considers the resort to Arthurian convention in court festivals, the poet's habit of weaving into his work bits of material from the life of his time, and the capital place of *The Faerie Queene* in the treatment of the Tudor-Arthur return motif in Elizabethan literature. It is my purpose in this paper to show that, although the feast motif must ultimately go back to the romances, in all probability, it is also an allegorical treatment of some features of the revival of chivalry at Elizabeth's court.

In the Letter to Raleigh, Spenser writes, in part, in explaining the significance of the feast as the key to his structure:

In the beginning of the feast, there presented him selfe a tall clownishe younge man, who falling before the Queen of Faries desired a boone (as the manner then was) which during that feast she might not refuse: which was that hee might have the atchievement of any adventure which during that feaste should happen. . . .

¹ "Notes on Elizabethan Chivalry and *The Faerie Queene*," *SP.*, xxx (1933), 148-159.

Compare this with one of the incidents of Elizabeth's coronation banquet as reported by Holinshed:

In the mean time, whilest hir grace sat at dinner, sir Edward Dimmocke knight, hir champion by office, came riding into the hall in faire complet armor, mounted upon a beautifull courser, richlie trapped in cloth of gold, entred the hall, and in the midst thereof cast downe his gantlet: with offer to fight with him in hir quarrel, that should denie hir to be the righteous and lawfull queene of the realme. The queene taking a cup of gold full of wine, drank to him thereof, and sent it to him for his fee together with the cover.²

Detailed resemblances between the two passages there are, of course, none. Nevertheless, we find in both instances the appearance of the champion and the patent resort to Arthurian material. These coronation day festivities were observed, in January, from year to year during Elizabeth's reign, and the appearance of the champion was one of the regular occurrences—romance commonplace, certainly, but just the kind of commonplace that Spenser so often lifted from the life of his day and embroidered into the allegory of his poem.

The same general similarity to the passage quoted above from Spenser's letter is found in an account of the annual observance of Elizabeth's accession to the throne on November 17, also a revival of Saint Elizabeth's day in honor of the queen. This notable holiday is explained by Sir William Segar as follows:

. . . these annuall exercises in armes, solemnized the 17. day of November, were first begun and occasioned by the right vertuous and honourable Sir Henry Lea, Master of her highnesse Armories, and now deservingly Knight of the Most Noble Order, who, of his great zeale and earnest desire to eternize the glory of her maiesties court, in the beginning of her happy reigne, voluntarily vowed . . . during his life, to present himselfe at the tilt armed, the day aforesaid yeerely, there to performe, in honor of her sacred maiestie, the promise he formerly made. Whereupon the lords and gentlemen of the sayd court, incited by so worthy an example, determined to continue that custome, and . . . have ever since yeerely assembled in arms accordingly. . . ."

This display of chivalry, more or less regularly observed from 1570 to the close of the queen's reign, was the most elaborate of all the

² *Chronicles* (London, 1807-8), iv, 176.

³ "The originall occasions of the yeerely triumphs in England," quoted by Dyce, ed., *Works of Greene and Peele* (London, 1861), p. 566.

knightly foregatherings of the age.⁴ For the occasions of this exhibition in 1590 and in 1595 Peele supplied poems flattering the queen and her courtiers in the most fulsome terms.⁵ On the latter occasion the pageantry was led by Essex,⁶ and the speeches for the show were written by Francis Bacon, his one venture into pure belles lettres.⁷ Considering the yearly observance of this exhibition, the jousting of the knights—among them Spenser's friends and patrons—it is probable that the poet drew upon this celebration of accession day, as well as upon the coronation banquets, when he planned the motivating force of his poem.

There is a third point of resemblance between this part of the allegory of *The Faerie Queene* and the actual life of the court. Saint George's Day, April 23, was solemnly observed by the queen and her Knights of the Garter. The ceremonies included a religious service in the court chapel, followed by a procession of the queen and the knights and heralds, all in their brilliant official costumes, about the courtyard and through the great hall of the castle. It was at this time, also, that new knights were elected to the Order.⁸ A little later, usually in May or June, came the Feast of Saint George, which marked the official installation of those knights who had been elected to the Order in April. These Saint George celebrations, revolving about a band of knights originally organized by Edward III on the model of Arthur's Round Table and having, as I have already pointed out,⁹ a significant part in the chivalry of Spenser's poem, also have a part in the background of the poet's use of the feast motif.

Finally, the Christmas holidays were another time of great entertainment at court. The season was spent in feasting, in the presentation of plays and masques, in the offering of rich New

⁴ For the part played by Sir Henry Lea in these exercises, see Sara Ruth Watson's "The Queen's Champion," *Western Reserve Univ. Bulletin*, New Series, xxxiv, no. 13, 65-89.

⁵ See Greene and Peele, *Works*, ed. Dyce, 569 ff., 595 ff.

⁶ *Sidney State Papers*, ed. Arthur Collins (London, 1746), I, 362.

⁷ Bacon, *Works*, ed. Basil Montagu (Philadelphia, 1842), II, 533 ff.

⁸ For detailed accounts of the pageantry of this occasion, see John Nichols, *Progresses of Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1823), I, 67, 88-89; also *The Diary of Henry Machyn*, ed. Nichols, *Camden Society Pub.*, No. 42 (1847-8), 232, 257-58, 280, 305-6.

⁹ "Notes on Elizabethan Chivalry and *The Faerie Queene*," 156-59.

Year's gifts to the queen, and in a display of chivalry sometimes revealing the prowess of the knights in foot combats.¹⁰ This was truly an annual twelve days' festival, extending as it usually did from Christmas to Twelfth-Night.

Obviously there are no direct parallels between any of the occasions I have cited and Spenser's explanation and use of the feast motif. This is, however, entirely beside the point, since I do not pretend that these festivals are to be considered source materials in a restricted sense. As influences they are to be grouped with the Kenilworth masques¹¹ and the fairy queen of the provincial pageants;¹² they are not immediate sources but episodes from the chivalric exercises of the Elizabethan court that, translated and transformed, find their way into the structural forces of a poem glorifying Elizabeth and the poet's friends and patrons in a day when the conventions of chivalry are shot through the literature and life of the age.

IVAN L. SCHULZE

Texas State College for Women

SYMBOLISM IN *FAERIE QUEENE*, II. 12

I have tried to show elsewhere¹ that a good many passages in *Faerie Queene*, II. 12, are at least susceptible of an allegorical interpretation. A few more may be added to the number. As Sir Guyon and the Palmer approach their destination, they are addressed by a band of five mermaids² who lure them with their sweet voices and their flattery. Spenser has in mind the Sirens, for he mentions their contest with the Muses. But the Sirens were three. It is natural to surmise that we have here a symbol of the five senses. An analogous case comes to mind. Fulgentius³ ex-

¹⁰ E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford, 1923), I, 19.

¹¹ See Edwin Greenlaw, "Spenser's Fairy Mythology," *SP.*, xv (1918), 105-7.

¹² See C. R. Baskervill, "The Genesis of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*," *MP.*, xviii (1920), 49-54.

¹ Cf. "The Influence of Trissino on *The Faerie Queene*," *PQ.*, vii, 3 (1928); and "The Symbolism of the Classical Episodes in *The Faerie Queene*," *PQ.*, viii, 3 (1929).

² 2. 30. 8.

³ Cf. Staveren, *Auctores mythographi latini*, Lyons, 1742, p. 682.

plains in this way the five daughters of Apollo,—Pasiphaë, Medea, Phaedra, Circe, and Dirce. The songs of the mermaids may not impossibly symbolize the allurements and the pride of the flesh. For a moment Sir Guyon is lulled into inaction by song and murmuring wave; then, thanks to his wise companion, he rouses himself from sensual contentment and faces the struggle.

The voyagers are nearing the shore when a dense fog envelops them, and birds of ill omen add horror to the gloom. The allegory is true to life. He who resists the will of nature in him does so in ignorance and even in fear of her might. Despite these obstacles, the two companions land; but they are now set upon by a monstrous rabble. The "wilde beasts"⁴ probably represent the passions, or perhaps the opposition of the unreasoning and dissolute. The Palmer duly quells them with his staff. It will be recalled that Tasso's good magician performs a similar feat⁵ with what was originally suggested to the poet by the rod of ashwood, feared of serpents.⁶ Spenser, instead, has in mind the caduceus of Mercury.⁷ Now Natalis Comes, perhaps following Macrobius,⁸ interprets Mercury not only as eloquence but also as reason,⁹—"the divine spark which God infused into the minds of men," "the divine reason and wisdom of God, whence our souls are derived." In Argus we are to see anger, ready to take offence at a hundred things; and indeed reason conquers our angry passions. Rightly was Mercury believed to calm the turbulent ocean. Here we recall Sir Guyon's stormy voyage. As Upton says, the Palmer's staff represents reason, the wise man's magic wand.

Sir Guyon and the Palmer enter Acrasia's garden by the ivory gate of false earthly dreams; but the Knight is strong in his virtuous temperance, and disdainfully upsets Genius's tempting "mazer bowle."¹⁰ Warton traced Genius to Natalis Comes,¹¹ who identifies the "bad Genius" of the ancients with those self-willed impulses which often cloud our reason and conscience.¹² It may

⁴ 4. 9. 6.

⁵ *Gerusalemme Liberata*, xv, 49.

⁶ *Le Lettere di Torquato Tasso*, Firenze, Le Monnier, 1854, I, 197.

⁷ 7. 41.

⁸ *Saturnaliorum*, I, 19. Cf. Eyssenhardt's edition of complete works, Leipzig, 1893, p. 111.

⁹ *Mythologiae*, Venice, 1581, v. 5. 296.

¹⁰ 49. 3.

¹¹ I, 114.

¹² *Op. cit.*, IV. 3. 195.

very well be, however, that Spenser used another source as well. Upton pointed out that Dame Excess, by whom the two companions are subjected to their next temptation, recalls a passage in the allegorical narrative attributed to Kebes of Thebes. Here we see the souls of men passing through a gate into life. At the gate stands Genius, who advises them as to their journey; hard by sits a smooth-spoken woman named Deceit, who offers them draughts of error and ignorance from her cup; further on await women, embodiments of desires and pleasures, who lead the travellers away. I think it probable that Spenser availed himself of this passage and its Platonic symbolism, but more extensively and originally than Upton seems to have perceived. In Genius the poet embodied the deceitful whispering of self-misleading impulse,—the first enemy virtue must contend with; in Dame Excess, with her luscious grapes and glittering gold, the intemperate gratification of impulse, the indulgence of desires in excessive pleasures. He who drinks of Genius's bowl lends an ear to the tempter within him and is ripe for actual incontinence. He who drinks of Dame Excess's cup will presently drink of Acrasia's also and turn into a brute; for, as Alanus says,¹³ all forms of intemperance lead to the climax of sensuality. Spenser points to the road which goes from mental earthliness to general looseness of conduct, and thence to gross debauchery. Genius's mazer bowl may well have been associated in his mind with the Cup of Bacchus, which plunges into a forgetfulness of spiritual things the soul descending to earth¹⁴ and keeps it in darkness after its incarceration in the body.¹⁵ Sir Guyon, thanks to his good genius the Palmer, does not forget; nor does he listen to the smooth-spoken woman. Therefore he is able to resist the naked damsels who await further on.

I have pointed out elsewhere that the "trayle of yvie" which hangs, presumably, from a column in the center of Acrasia's fountain,¹⁶ is probably a symbol of lust. Ivy is the plant of Bacchus, and Bacchus, identified with the sun, was familiar to the Stoics, to Plutarch, to the Neo-Platonists, as the embodiment of the mascu-

¹³ *De planctu Naturæ*, Prose VI.

¹⁴ Cf. Macrobius, *Com. in somn. Scip.*, I, 12, *edit. cit.*, p. 532.

¹⁵ Cf. Plotinus, *Complete Works*, Alpine, Platonist Press, 1918, I, 127; Porphyry, *De antro nympharum*, tr. by T. Taylor, London, 1823, p. 34; Stewart, *The Myths of Plato*, New York, Macmillan, 1905, p. 240.

¹⁶ 61. 2.

line principle in nature. Water stood for the feminine principle. Comes interprets both in this sense at some length.¹⁷ Acrasia's fountain is as significant as a phallus would be. Hardly less so are the naked boys carved in the sides,—Cupids, presumably, for they seem "to fly about, playing their wanton toys."¹⁸ To return to my starting-point, the meaning which Spenser attached to ivy is suggested by another passage in Book II. It will be recalled that in Canto V Atin, eager to avenge the discomfiture of Pyrochles, speeds off to his brother and finds that dissolute warrior in Acrasia's garden, lolling in the midst of her decidedly licentious maids and boys:

And over him Art, stryving to compayre
With Nature, did an arber greene dispred,
Framed of wanton yvie, flouring fayre,
Through which the fragrant eglantine did spred
His prickling armes, entrayled with roses red.¹⁹

Roses were sacred to Venus, and judging by Sonnet XXVI the eglantine may well have been intended to suggest the thorns which make the rose of love but the more tempting. I have no doubt that Spenser understood the symbolism of "wanton yvie," with its "lascivious armes,"²⁰ perfectly.

All obstacles overcome, Sir Guyon and the Palmer descend upon the enchantress. The fair Acrasia is reclining on a bed of roses, her charms more than half revealed by "a vele of silke and silver thin" of which Spenser tells us that "more subtile web Arachne cannot spin."²¹ The comparison is not an unusual one; but the fact remains that the spider's web was,²² and still is, a common symbol of the snares which beset weak mortals. We recall Mammon's cave, too:

And over them Arachne high did lifte
Her cunning web, and spred her subtile nett.²³

The two men who creep up to Acrasia unperceived are provided with a harsher net:

A subtile net, which onely for the same
The skilfull Palmer formally did frame.²⁴

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, X, 685. ¹⁸ 60. 8. ¹⁹ II. 5. 29. ²⁰ 61. 6. ²¹ 77. 7.

²² Cf. Legouais *Ovide moralisé*, Cat's *Emblems*, etc.

²³ II. 7. 28.

²⁴ 81. 4-5.

A moment more and the enchantress and her lover are caught, just as Venus and Mars were, long ago. Spenser might very well have availed himself of a familiar classic episode without ulterior motives; yet Natalis Comes interprets that episode as follows:

And indeed what wicked man steeped in sin can long be happy? Not uncounted wealth, not crowds of friends, not nobility of descent, not empire, not armies, can indefinitely shield the sinner from deserved punishment, from the vengeance of God.²⁵

The interpretation certainly fits our case. Despite her riches, despite her embattled lovers, the queen of the sensual falls at last.

CHARLES W. LEMMI

Goucher College

THE SERPENT AND THE EAGLE IN SPENSER AND SHELLEY

The combat between the Red Cross Knight and Sansioy at the court of Lucifera is one of the most spirited encounters in the *Faerie Queene*; and indeed it should be, for the very natures of the antagonists are at daggers drawn. In the Red Cross Knight we see an embodiment of holiness, of eager desire to obey the will of God; in his opponent we see a rakehell and a rebel. It is Sansioy who wrests his brother's shield from the page,¹ rebelling against the law of arms, rebelling against court decorum, rebelling against whatever would restrain him. There is something satanic about Sansioy. The fight, then, is a fierce one, and Spenser illustrates it with a vigorous and striking simile:

So th'one for wrong, the other strives for right
As when a Gryfon, seized of his pray,
A Dragon fiers encountreth in his flight,
Through widest ayre making his ydle way,
That would his rightfull ravine rend away:
With hideous horror both together smight,
And souce so sore that they the heavens affray;
The wise Southsayer, seeing so sad sight,
Th'amazed vulgar telles of warres and mortall fight.²

²⁵ II. 6. 103.

¹ I, 4, 39.

² I, 5, 8.

The last two lines suggest the probable source of this description. It will be recalled that in the twelfth book of the *Iliad* a serpent and an eagle appear struggling in mid-air above the Trojan army, and that the spectacle amazes the Trojans and is interpreted by Polydamas as an omen of disaster. But how curiously has our poet altered the Homeric episode. The serpent and the eagle have become a dragon and a griffin. In the case of the serpent there might be some doubt; for the word *dragon* was used with a certain latitude, in Spenser's times, and Chapman applies both terms to the Homeric reptile. But Spenser definitely means a proper or winged dragon. As for the eagle there can be no doubt at all. It is natural to wonder what recommended these substitutions.

A desire to avoid triteness may very well have been one of Spenser's motives for transforming the serpent and the eagle into something new. The combatants described by Homer are an almost wearisome commonplace in classic literature and elsewhere.³ Again, an artist's eye for the picturesque may have had something to do with the matter. But were these the poet's only reasons? I think not; and if I am right, we have here a curious bit of symbolism entirely appropriate to the occasion and wholly characteristic of the great allegorist. The griffin has usually been associated with righteousness. The ancients related⁴ how griffins guarded Scythian gold against the rapacity of travelers, and a glance at *Burke's Peerage* is sufficient to establish the fact that in heraldry the griffin was a familiar symbol of righteous tenacity. Nor is this all. One of the most striking passages in *Physiologus* goes as follows:

The Griffin is the largest bird of all the birds of heaven. It lives in the far East in an inlet of the ocean-stream. And, when the sun rises over the water-depths and lights the world with its beams, the Griffin spreads out its wings and receives the rays of the sun. And another rises with it, and the two fly together towards the sunset, as it is written: "Spread thy wings, dispenser of light; give the world light."

In like manner stand the two Griffins for the Godhead, that is for the Archangel Michael and the Holy Mother of God, and they receive thy spirit, so that it may not be said: "I know you not."

Well now spake Physiologus concerning the Griffin.

³ *Aeneid*, XI; *Metamorphoses*, IV, 712 seq.; Pliny, *Naturalis historiae*, x, 5; Gesner, *Historiae animalium*, v; *Orlando Furioso*, x, 103; etc.

⁴ Cf. Herodotus, *History*, III, 16; and especially Solinus, *Rerum memorabilium*, xv, 10, where it is declared that the griffins tear predators to pieces "velut geniti ad plectendam avaritiæ temeritatem."

In Dante the griffin stands for Christ. The great stone griffin at Verona holds down the writhing form of the Old Dragon.⁵ Truly: "So th'one for wrong, the other strives for right."

As we read the first canto of the *Revolt of Islam*, we again behold the struggle in mid-air; and again are reminded of the *Iliad*. I do not mean to imply that the fight between the serpent and the eagle is derived entirely from this source; indeed, much of it more closely recalls the *Aeneid*.⁶ Yet not Virgil's but Homer's eagle drops the huge reptile and speeds away with a cry "down the gusts of the wind." Doubtless Shelley had both descriptions in mind; but in any case Virgil was himself indebted to Homer. Fundamentally, then, we have here the same material used by Spenser. We almost lose sight of the fact in our startled sense of contrast. The Serpent has become a saint. "Oh Gemini," might say Lucian's much wondering Micyllus "who ever would have thought it possible!" Perhaps Eve would,—Eve in a Godwinian sequel to *Paradise Lost*. I wish I might persuade myself that Godwin inspired the tender scene on the shore; but much more probably Boiardo did. In the famous Italian's masterpiece, Orlando, having reached the shore of a certain lake, sees a lady there, tenderly weeping over a dead dragon. Orlando stops in some astonishment; but how much greater is his amazement when the lady takes the monster in her arms and with it enters a little boat which immediately speeds away.⁷ The next canto identifies the

⁵ Cf. Ruskin, *Modern Painters*, New York, Merrill and Baker, 1873, III, 140.

⁶ I refer, of course, to Book XI, 751-756.

⁷ *Orlando Innamorato*, ed. Panizzi, Pickering, 1831, II, xii, 59-60:

Così mirando vide morto un drago,
Ed una dama con pietosa ciera
Piangea quel drago morto in su la riva,
Com'ella fusse di suo amante priva.

La Dama il drago morto in braccio piglia,
E con quello entra in una navicella,
Correndo giù per l'acqua a la seconda,
E in mezzo il lago appunto si profonda.

It will be recalled that in the first canto of *The Revolt of Islam* Shelley relates how, standing by the sea, he beheld a combat between a serpent and an eagle (stanzas 8-14); and how a beautiful woman, who had also watched the encounter, gathered the wounded serpent in her arms (stanzas

lady as the enchantress Morgana, who has turned the young knight Ziliante into a dragon in the vain hope that he may frighten away intruders on her domain without danger to himself. In her palace at the bottom of the lake, Morgana restores the youth to life and to his proper form. Not impossibly, this same episode had some influence on *Prometheus Unbound* as well; for it is in the name of Demogorgon, stronger than all other spirits or powers, that Orlando presently sets Morgana's captive free.³

CHARLES W. LEMMI

Goucher College

A BRACE OF VILLAINS

Arden of Feversham was printed for the first time in 1592 and the fifth book of *The Faerie Queene* was not published until four years later. Nevertheless an odd parallel between the description of the villain Malengin in the *F. Q.* and another villain in *Arden* suggests that the passage in *Arden* is later than the other, so that the manuscript version of this part of *F. Q.* must have been in existence as early as 1592 at least.

There are several reasons for thinking the *Arden* passage later. The language is in part Spenserese; the description is more detailed than that of Spenser, although following the same order; the passage has no source in Holinshed, whose account the anonymous author of *Arden* followed closely; the thief so carefully described is of no consequence in the play, so that such a clear portrait—far clearer than that given the major actors—is not needed. Altogether the evidence suggests that the author of *Arden* merely found the scarecrow in another man's field and added to his picturesque rags.

If the author of *Arden* was Kyd, as many scholars believe, this procedure seems the more natural and likely. Kyd often uses Spenserisms; in *Soliman and Perseda* he has passages which strongly suggest *F. Q.*; snapping up of unconsidered trifles was, moreover, a pastime of his. This borrowing is much in his man-

16-20) and, accompanied by the poet, glided away in "a boat of rare device" (stanzas 22-23) to the Temple of the Spirit. Here the story of Cythna and Laon, which occupies the rest of the poem, was presently told.

³ II, 13, 29.

ner. The thief is an insignificant fellow who never appears on the stage, but we know from face to foot-gear how this non-actor looks. Spenser had described him, and Kyd, or some other if Kyd be not the author of *Arden*, supplied all concrete details except one.

Full dreadfull wight he was, as ever went
 Vpon the earth, with hollow eyes deepe pent,
 And long curled lockes that downe his shoulders shagged,
 And on his back an uncouth vestiment
 Made of straunge stuffe, but all to-worne and ragged,
 And underneath his breach was all to-torne and jagged.

F. Q., V, ix, 10.

Except for the eyes and the hair this is not highly specific. The version in *Arden* is an identification:

Brad. . . . so vile a rogue as he
 Lyves not againe upon the earth . . .
 A leane faced writhen knaue,
 Hauke nosde and verye hollow eied, . . .
 Long haire downe his shoulders curled; . . .

Will. What apparell had he?

Brad. A watchett sattin doublet all to torne, . . .
 A paire of velvet threadbare hose, seame rent,
 A worsted stocking rent about the shoe,
 A liuery cloake, but all the lace was of.

Arden of Feversham, II, i, ed. Brooke in *Shakespeare Apocrypha*, p. 12.

Those details, however, which seem not to have been furnished by *F. Q.* may be found elsewhere in Spenser:

The ape clad souldier-like. . . .
 In a blew jacket. . . .
 With manie slits. . . .
 And his hose broken high above the heeling,
 And his shoes beaten out with travelling.

Mother Hubbard's Tale, 207-8.

MARION GRUBB

Tennessee College

KYD'S BORROWING FROM GARNIER'S *BRADAMANTE*

Although Thomas Kyd translated a French tragedy, *Cornélie*, by Robert Garnier, and adapted a French tale by Jacques Yver, little investigation has been made into his possible use of French sources

in his original work. A few lines in *The Spanish Tragedy* are supposed to have been suggested by a short passage in *Cornélie*; ¹ a few lines in *Arden of Feversham* are supposed to have been suggested by *Cornélie*.² Neither of these parallels is very striking.

Since Kyd was an inveterate borrower, and his so-called original work is anything but original in detail, we should expect him to take advantage of an opportunity to draw upon the other plays of Garnier. These other plays, except *Bradamante*, the one tragic-comedy, were available in the edition of 1585 used by him for his translation. There are evidences here and there that he did use them, but these evidences have to do with vocabulary and phrasing rather than with direct parallels. He might have made use of *Bradamante* in the edition of 1582.³ Certainly one bit of braggadocio in *Soliman and Perseda* offers so close a parallel with *Bradamante* that if Kyd read it at all, he probably drew upon it for this passage:

Sooth to say, the earth is my country
As the aire to the fowle, or the marine moisture
To the red guild fish . . .
Each place is my habitation;
Therefore each country's word is mine to pronounce . . .
And where a man liues well, there is his country.

Soliman and Perseda, I, iii, 79-81, 112-13; IV, ii, 7.

The corresponding passage in *Bradamante* has the same sententious tone, and it employs the same figures: world-country, air-birds, fish-sea, etc. In both instances the passage is built around a proverb, the same Latin proverb: *Patria est ubicumque est bene*.

Seule on ne doit priser la contrée où nous sommes,
Tout ce terrestre rond est le pais des hommes,
Comme l'air des oiseaux, et des poissons la mer:
Vn lieu comme vn estuy ne nous doit enfermer . . .
Le pais est partout où l'on se trouue bien.
La terre est aux mortels une maison commune:
Dieux seme en tous endroits nostre bonne fortune.

Bradamante, 580-83, 587-9, ed. Foerster, Heilbronn, 1883.

No similar passage is to be found in the source of *Soliman and Perseda*, Henry Wotton's *Courtlie Controuersie of Cupids Cautels*,

¹ Kyd, *Works*, ed. Boas, p. xviii.

² Sykes, *Sidelights on Shakespeare*, p. 74.

³ Robert Estienne, Paris, 1582.

a translation of Jacques Yver's *Printemps d'Iver* (1572). This passage from Garnier seems to have been deliberately lifted for insertion in *Soliman and Perseda*.

MARION GRUBB

Tennessee College

HOTSPUR'S EARTHQUAKE

So far, Shakespearian commentators have traced Hotspur's theory of the cause of earthquakes,

oft the teeming earth
Is with a kind of colic pinch'd and vex'd
By the imprisoning of the unruly wind
Within her womb; which for enlargement striving,
Shakes the old beldam earth and topples down
Steeple and moss-grown towers,¹

to such classical sources as Plutarch's *Opinions of Philosophers* and Pliny's *Natural History*.² Since both of these writers offer this theory as one among many, one wonders why Shakespeare's imagination should be taken by it rather than by the water theory or some other. The question is probably answered by mediaeval tradition.

Of the many theories offered by Plutarch, Pliny, Livy, Seneca, and other writers of antiquity, the idea of the caged winds is the one that found the readiest acceptance and emphasis in the Middle Ages. The reason for this is difficult to discover unless one is willing to admit that the Virgilian cave of the winds which "magno cum murmure montis, circum claustra fremunt" had something to do with mediaeval emphasis on this theory. Apparently the first mention of this theory occurs in the *De Natura Rerum* of Isidore of Seville who, after a general summary which includes quotations from Sallustius and Lucanus, says, "Terraemotum autem illic assidue fieri, ubi cava terrarum sunt, in quibus venti ingrediuntur, et faciunt terraemotum."³ The same scientific

¹ *I Henry IV*, III, i, 28-33.

² R. P. Cowl and A. E. Morgan, *The First Part of Henry IV*, Arden ed., pp. 103-104.

³ Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, LXXXIII, 1015.

result is obtained by Bede,⁴ Honorius Augustodensis,⁵ and Alexander Neckham.⁶ Perhaps more important for the general knowledge of Shakespeare's time was the emphasis given to this theory by Caxton's translation of the popular French encyclopaedia, the *Image du Monde*, which devotes a whole chapter to the discussion of this idea.⁷ It will be seen that in the strict sense the theory of Hotspur is mediaeval in emphasis rather than classical.

Whether or not Shakespeare subscribed to this theory is difficult to say; however, a reference in *As You Like It*⁸ to the ability of earthquakes to move mountains suggests that Shakespeare may have been *au courant* with the more advanced discussions of his age. Although this power of the earthquake is overlooked by the mediaeval authorities, it is mentioned by Cardanus in his classification of earthquakes—it is Brasmaticus “cum attolitur: sic fiunt montes, et in mari insulae nascuntur.”⁹ A further emphasis of this idea is to be found in *Troilus and Cressida* where Ulysses suggests that earthquakes are caused by errant planets¹⁰—an idea that Cardanus indicates obliquely in his account of comets.¹¹ If Shakespeare was aware of the Renaissance theory as distinguished from that of the Middle Ages, he may have been consciously ironic when he placed the obsolete theory in the speech of the young warrior who was mocking Glendower for his superstitious ideas.

DON CAMERON ALLEN

State College of Washington

⁴ “De Natura Rerum,” Migne, *op. cit.*, xc, 275-276.

⁵ “De Imagine Mundi,” Migne, *op. cit.*, clxxii, 134.

⁶ *De Naturis Rerum* (Wright ed., 1863), II, 48.

⁷ *Mirroure of the World* (Prior ed., *EETS*, e. s. cx, 1913), pp. 114-115.

⁸ III, ii, 196.

⁹ “De rerum varietate,” *Opera* (1663), I, 16. The other three types are: Chasmatibus which opens cracks in the earth, Clitimachus which overturns buildings, and Micematus which produces a great noise. Cf. also, “De Subtilitate Rerum,” *op. cit.*, I, 402: “Ex terrae motibus montes quandoque flunt.”

¹⁰ I, iii, 97.

¹¹ “De rerum varietate,” *op. cit.*, I, 2.

THE PRINTER'S COPY FOR *THE CITY-MADAM*

In his admirable edition of Massinger's comedy *The City-Madam* (Princeton University Press, 1934, p. 7) Dr. R. Kirk refers to a note (*RES.*, VII, 206)¹ in which I said that "The quarto of *The City-Madam* was printed from a manuscript . . . which was most likely in Massinger's autograph," and very justly resents my expressing such an opinion without adducing a scrap of evidence in support of it.

For the purpose of that note it did not much matter what sort of manuscript the printer used, and for that reason I did not want to enter on an elaborate discussion of the rather tenuous evidence. I ought not to have raised the question at all; but since I did so, and since Dr. Kirk has expressed the hope that I "or some other authority on seventeenth-century hand-writing will clear up the issue," I blushinglly acknowledge the quite unmerited compliment and proceed to say my piece.

The printer of the Quarto (now identified beyond question by Dr. Kirk as being Jane Bell) has rigorously modernized the spelling according to her own rather eccentric standards (for example omitting the final "e" in such words as "knowledg" and "leav"); there is therefore not much hope of tracing in the printed text many spellings characteristic of Massinger's autograph. On the other hand this very fact increases the evidential value of any personal spellings that do survive, and there are a few of them. Professor C. J. Sisson observed in the introduction to his Malone Society edition of *Beleeue as you List* (p. xiv) that Massinger "takes thought concerning the spelling of . . . *perfe(ct)*, which he changes to *perfit*" and "invariably inserts a *c* in such words as *thancke*, *sincke*, &c." In *The City-Madam* we find "*perfit* (v, iii, 5 & 8), "*sinck*" (III, ii, 124), and "*truncks*" (IV, iv, 139). None of these spellings is in the least peculiar to Massinger, but it has some slight significance that where the orthography of the Quarto does depart from the printer's rule it spells in a way which an impartial observer has noted as being characteristic of Massinger.

¹ He also cites an article in *The Library* (XI, 78) where I spoke even more confidently, and for this I have no defence to offer—except that I was misquoting myself.

To my own mind there is more weighty evidence in two mistakes which the printer made in setting up the type and corrected whilst the sheets of the Quarto were passing through the press, "caducevs" (in Roman) corrected to "*Caduceus*" (in italics, III, ii, 169) and "Hymas" corrected to "him as" (I, iii, 131). Sisson noted that in Massinger's hand "A v is very frequently used medially, as in *ever, exeunt, triumph*," and I would add that it is often very difficult to tell whether he intended a small "c" or a capital "C"; these characteristics of his hand would account for "caducevs." Again, Sisson notes "hym" amongst the "invariable" forms which words take in *Beleeue as you List*, and no one could read that play either in Sisson's printed transcript or in Farmer's photographic facsimile without noticing Massinger's partiality for meaningless capital "H"s—there is one in the second line of the play and another in the first line of the second speech. This would account for "Hymas" (which a printer might well take for a classical name on the analogy of Hymen or Hylas).

I should not have claimed to have anything amounting to *proof* that the printer's copy for *The City-Madam* was in the author's own handwriting, but when the few departures from a later norm of spelling are in accord with his practice, and when two of the printer's few known errors are ones to which his tricks of writing might well give rise, I think that there are at any rate some grounds for a surmise that the manuscript "was most likely in Massinger's autograph."

A. K. McILWRAITH

University of Liverpool

DESPORTES AND ARIOSTO: ADDITIONAL SOURCES IN THE ORLANDO AND THE LIRICHE

Everyone knows that Desportes was a liberal, not to say slavish, imitator of the Italians. The *Rencontres des Muses de France et d'Italie* (Lyon, Jacques Roussin, 1604), and the researches of MM. Flamini and Vianey,¹ with a few additions by Dr. Kastner,² have

¹ Cf. Francesco Flamini, *Studi di storia letteraria italiana e straniera*, Livorno, Giusti, 1895, pp. 341-381 and 433-439; and Joseph Vianey, "Une Rencontre des Muses de France et d'Italie demeurée inédite," *RHL*,

shown how much he took. The imitations amount in all to about a hundred. Their substance comes from the various sixteenth-century collections of *Rime scelte*, from the *Canzoniere* of Petrarch, and from the *Orlando Furioso*. It has generally been held that these *rapprochements* represent almost the sum total of Desportes' debt to Italy; that most of the gleanings of sources has been done, and that his other poems must be largely, if not entirely, original.

How thoroughly his other sources have been explored I can not decide; but regarding his borrowings from Ariosto something still remains to be said. In 1828 Saint-Beuve had remarked that the elegy *Contre une nuit trop claire* (*Diverses Amours*) was a translation of the *capitolo* "O nei miei danni più che'l giorno chiara";³ and M. Vianey mentions two pieces in the *Amours d'Hippolyte* and one in the *Elégies* which show the influence of the *Orlando*;⁴ but no one seems to have noticed that Sonnet LII of the *Amours d'Hippolyte*,⁵ "Bien que le mal d'Amour, qui me rend furieux," is an adaptation of Ariosto's sonnet, "Ben che'l martir,"⁶ or that a *Plainte*, "Quand je pense aux plaisirs qu'on reçoit en aimant," in the *Amours de Diane*, I (p. 60), is simply a rearrangement of his *capitolo* "Chi pensa quanto," with four lines to the stanza instead of three. The chief difference between complaint and *capitolo* lies in the fact that Ariosto concludes pessimistically that it is better to stay out of love than to suffer its pangs and disappointments, while Desportes, with characteristic suavity, declares that the lover's life, and that of the untamed bachelor, have equal charms.

In arranging material taken from the *Orlando*, he is usually

1906, pp. 92-100, and *Le Pétrarquisme en France au XVI^e siècle*, Montpellier, Coulet, 1909, chapter on Desportes.

³L. E. Kastner, "Desportes et Angelo di Costanzo," *RHL.*, 1908, pp. 113 sqq., and "Desportes et Guarini," *RHL.*, 1910, pp. 124 sqq.

⁴*Tableau*, II, 285.

⁵*Hipp.*, xxv: *O.F.* XLIV, 61; *Hipp.*, *Stances* (p. 176), "Comme on voit . . . Et rien qui soit . . .": *O.F.* xxxvii, 110; *Elégies*, I, 15, from "A l'homme trop avare . . ." to end: *O.F.* XLV, 34-39; cf. *Le Pétrarquisme en France*, *cap. cit.*

⁶*Œuvres de Philippe Desportes*, ed. by Alfred Michiels, Paris, Delahays, 1858; p. 152.

⁷*Lirica di Ludovico Ariosto*, ed. by Giuseppe Fatini, *Scrittori d'Italia*, Vol. 95, Bari, Laterza, 1924.

unable to resist that passion for explanation, definition and over-clarification which is one of his chief defects, and with which his critics have so frequently charged him.⁷ Thus in converting into a sonnet some lines from one of Bradamante's laments on the absence of her lover, he manages to quench the spirit of the fiery stanza in a thin drizzle of repetitions:

O grand démon volant, arrête la meurtrière
Qui fuit devant mes pas, car pour moy je ne puis;
Ma course est trop tardive, et plus je la poursuis,
Et plus elle s'avance, en me laissant derrière.

Ou fay que son vouloir s'accorde à ma prière,
Ou ne me laisse plus en l'estat que je suis;
Rends moy comme j'estois, sans dame et sans ennuis,
Et delivre ma vie, en ses yeux prisonnière.

Si tu es juste, Amour, tu me dois délier,
Ou par un doux effort ceste dure plier;
Mais, las! que mon attente est folle et misérable!
J'importune un tyran, qui de nos maux se plaist,
Qui s'abreuve de pleurs, qui d'ennuis se repaist,
Et plus il est prié, moins il est pitoyable.

(*Diane*, I, Son. VI; p. 15)

Deh ferma, Amor, costui che così sciolto
Dinanzi al lento mio correr s'affretta;
O tornami nel grado onde m'hai tolto,
Quando nè a te nè ad altri era suggetta!
Deh, come è il mio sperar fallace e stolto,
Ch'in te con prieghi mai pietà si metta;
Che ti diletta, anzi ti pasci e vivi
Di trar dagli occhi lacrimosi rivi!

(*O.F.* xxxii, 20)

Desportes, like his predecessors of the Pléiade, shows a decided preference for Bradamante. It is from her speeches and meditations on the cruelty of her neglectful fiancé that he has taken the comparisons of a place once inhabited with the loved one, and later revisited alone, with a garden seen in summer, then in winter (*Complainte*, stanzas 6 and 7, *Diane*, I, p. 47; *O.F.* XLV, 26); and of the creeping doubts and fears that assail him in his sweetheart's absence with the shadows that lengthen as the evening sun declines (*Plainte*, stanza 10, *Diane*, II, p. 70; *O.F.* XLV, 36). From the same source comes his eulogy of constancy, that virtue

⁷ Cf. Vianey, *Le Pétrarquisme en France*, pp. 241-243; and Flamini, *op. cit.*, pp. 350-352.

without which all the others are dimmed, as colors vanish in the absence of light (*Elegie* I, "Mais que ne faites-vous . . . Tout objet . . .," *Elégies*, I, p. 261; *O.F.* XXXII, 38-39). Moreover, his description of the attempted suicide of a certain "desolé Philandre," whose mistress has revealed herself as an "Alcine rusée," is inspired by a similar scene enacted by Bradamante. Like her, Philandre seizes a sword, exclaiming that his only regret is not to have died while in his lady's good graces, and is about to pierce his breast, when a good spirit arrests his right hand and whispers in his heart that it would be some consolation to avenge himself before he dies (*Elégie* XIX, "Mais, voyant que la mort . . . Mets fin à ton amour . . .," *Elégies*, I, 283-284; *O.F.* XXXII, 43-46).

Instead, however, of putting his plans immediately into execution, as had Bradamante, Philandre launches into a comprehensive vituperation of all womankind; this is taken from another part of the *Orlando*, King Rodomonte's furious monologue when he learns that he has been jilted by the Princess Doralice ("O féminin cerveau . . . Et des pauvres humains . . .," pp. 285-286; *O.F.* XXVII, 117-121).

It did not trouble Desportes that others might have used a source before him. The famous stanzas in which Ariosto warns women against the inconstant lover, who spares neither prayers, tears, nor promises until his object is attained, and who resembles a hunter, tracking a hare up-hill and down-dale, through good weather and bad, only to toss the beast aside when he has caught it, and go on in a new pursuit (*O.F.* x, 5-7), had already inspired Baïf and Jamyn. Nevertheless, Desportes likes the passage well enough to make use of it twice, once when telling the story of a lady who was seduced by someone much above her in rank (*Elégie* IX, "Et les grands . . . Et leur amitié . . .," *Elégies*, I, p. 258), and again in a *Chanson*, where he likens Death to the hunter who pursues only what flies (Stanza 7, *Hippolyte*, p. 135).

Less important, but not without interest, is the appearance, in a poem called *De la Jalousie*, of certain details taken from the thirty-first canto of the *Orlando*. Ariosto had said that any other difficulty in the lover's path, enforced absence, rebuffs, caprices, or ill-temper, only serves to make his reward the sweeter when at last it comes; but to a mind poisoned by suspicion, favors and

carresses give more pain than joy; this Desportes repeats (*op. cit.*, Stanzas 7-8, *Diane*, II, p. 90; *O.F.* xxxi, 3-4).⁸

Desportes imitated Ariosto, proportionately, much less frequently than he imitated Sasso, Tebaldeo, Costanzo and other rhymers of elaborate *concetti*. This is evident from the *rapprochements* already made between his work and theirs by MM. Flamini, Vianey, and Kastner. Therefore, since I have been able to discover fresh sources in Ariosto's lyrics and epic, it seems probable that hitherto undetected imitations of his other more favored models could still be brought to light.

It is also possible that the list of authors from whom he borrowed is as yet incomplete, and that new names could be added to it. Desportes is a combiner and adapter, not a creator; he could not, as did Ronsard, completely absorb and ingest in his own spirit the material that he took, or follow the traces of an older author merely as a kind of discipline and direction for his own first steps in a new field. He is heavily dependent on the borrowed elements which he cements together with a few conventional sentiments; and his poems show so little originality, are so lacking in any personal touch, that, except in the case of such pieces as *Eurylas* and *Cleophon* (*Elégies*, II, pp. 307 and 315), where Desportes is narrating events which he witnessed or in which he was a participator, their ancestry is open to doubt.

Further investigations by someone better acquainted with the minor Italian poets of the sixteenth century than I am should prove whether or not this viewpoint is exaggerated, and yield interesting results.

ALICE CAMERON

Maryland College for Women

⁸ M. Mathieu Augé-Chiquet, in an article entitled "D'une 'Canzone' de Corfino à la 'Psychée' de Corneille" (*RHL.*, 1908, pp. 507-510) has shown that besides its containing material taken from Corfino, Tansillo and Anacreon, two lines in the fourth stanza of this poem "En vain . . . Ce mal . . ." come from the above-mentioned canto of the *Orlando*, Stanza 5.

SOBRE LA FECHA DE FUENTE OVEJUNA

En la segunda parte de *La Santa Juana*, compuesta por Tirso de Molina a fines de 1613 o a principios del año siguiente,¹ hay un episodio tan parecido a la acción principal de *Fuente Ovejuna*, que hace sospechar la posibilidad de una influencia directa. La semejanza se verá más claramente eliminando las escenas que se refieren a la Santa.

Los aldeanos de Cubas reciben a su comendador, don Jorge de Aragón, con grandes muestras de regocijo. Pero el comendador, que es otro Fernán Gómez, comienza inmediatamente a abusar de su autoridad. Trata despóticamente a sus vasallos, les impone injustos tributos, ultraja a las mujeres, y no reconoce más ley que su capricho. Cansados de sufrir insultos y vejaciones, los aldeanos preparan una rebelión, que no llega a estallar porque el comendador fallece oportunamente.² El episodio termina acogiéndose el lugar entero a la autoridad del emperador Carlos V, que lo recibe gustoso bajo su protección.

Carlos: A no atajalle la muerte
vuestras injurias vengara.

Mingo: Pues es muerto, gran señor,
no queremos más venganza
ni en premio de la lealtad
que siempre este pueblo guarda,
sino ser vuestros.

Carlos: Yo aceto
tan fiel y justa demanda.
No tendréis otro señor.³

Como se ve, el argumento de este episodio concuerda en sus puntos fundamentales con el de *Fuente Ovejuna*, y el desenlace es idéntico al que Lope da a su drama. Pero la semejanza de ambas

¹ El autógrafo de la primera parte está firmado en mayo de 1613, y el de la tercera en agosto de 1614.

² Y porque a Tirso no le convenía dar demasiada importancia a la acción secundaria en perjuicio de la acción principal.

³ *Segunda parte de la Santa Juana*, acto III, esc. xx. (Ed. Cotarelo, NBAE., IX, 302.) Comp. *Fuente Ovejuna*, esc. final del acto III: "Alcalde: Señor, tuyos ser queremos. / Rey nuestro eres natural . . . Rey: . . . la villa es bien se quede / en mí, pues de mí se vale." (Ed. Castro, Madrid, Calpe, 1919, págs. 146 y 147.)

obras, aunque la originalidad de Tirso quede a salvo, no se limita al asunto. Intentaré señalar aquí algunas de las coincidencias más sospechosas.

Entre los lugareños que salen a recibir al comendador figuran dos alcaldes y varios músicos que cantan, como en *Fuente Ovejuna*, una canción de bienvenida. El comendador empieza a requebrar a Mari Pascuala, desposada con uno de los alcaldes, precisamente al final de esta escena, lo mismo que en el drama de Lope. Nótese además que Tirso llama a dos de sus personajes Pascuala y Mengo, nombres que aparecen también en *Fuente Ovejuna*.

Los criados del comendador raptan a Mari Pascuala durante la celebración de un bautizo, y Fernán Gómez, con sus criados, interrumpe una boda para llevarse a Laurencia. El paralelismo de ambas situaciones es evidente. Después, cuando los labradores se amotinan dispuestos a no consentir el ultraje, hay uno que se echa atrás por cobardía.

Crespo: ¿Eso consentís, cobardes?
¡Matalde!

Mingo: Mátele Dios
que le hizo.

Crespo: ¿Tal injuria
consentís? ¿Tan gran traición?

Mingo: A quien le duele la muela
que se la saque; andad vos,
si os atrevéis sin tenazas,
y sacalde ese raigón.⁴

Obsérvese el carácter cómico de esta escena, que sirve para terminar un acto, y compárese con esta otra de Lope, colocada también al final del acto correspondiente.

Barrildo: ¿No hay aquí un hombre que hable?

Mengo: Yo tengo ya mis azotes,
que aun se ven los cardenales
sin que un hombre vaya a Roma.
Prueben otros a enojarle.

Juan Rojo: Hablemos todos.

Mengo: Señores,
aquí todo el mundo calle.
Como ruedas de salmón
me puso los atabales.⁵

⁴ *S. J.*, acto I, esc. xxii.

⁵ *F. O.*, acto II, p. 98 de la ed. citada.

La escena en que los labradores exponen sus quejas al comendador se parece mucho también a otra de *Fuente Ovejuna*. Cuando don Jorge pregunta si es justo que los vasallos se opongan a su señor, Mingo responde:

Si afrentallos
quiere su travieso gusto,
¿qué mucho que se defienda
quien ve que ese honor se pierde? *

Y luego, ante las amenazas del comendador, uno de los villanos le recuerda que hay otra autoridad superior a la suya:

Mira que al Emperador
ofendes, y cuando venga
y destos agravios tenga
noticia, ha de hacer, señor,
el castigo que tú sabes,
de su justicia y enojo.⁷

Fácil sería encontrar otras equivalencias en las conversaciones que Lillo—el Flores de *Fuente Ovejuna*—tiene con su amo acerca de las mujeres, y en las orgullosas palabras que don Jorge dirige a sus vasallos,⁸ pero bastan las apuntadas para demostrar que Tirso había visto o leído la comedia de Lope antes de ponerse a escribir la suya.

Si esto es verdad, y para mí lo es indudablemente,⁹ Lope tuvo que componer *Fuente Ovejuna* en 1613 o poco antes. Lo único que hasta ahora sabemos con certeza sobre la fecha de esta comedia es que su título está incluido en la segunda lista de *El Peregrino* (1618), pero no en la primera (1604). Claude E. Anibal¹⁰ supone

* Comp. *F. O.*, p. 96: "No es mucho que en casos tales / se descomponga con vos / un hombre, en efecto, amante; / porque si vos pretendéis / su propia mujer quitarle / ¿qué mucho que se defienda?"

⁷ Comp. *F. O.*, p. 96: "Y esto baste; / que reyes hay en Castilla, / que nuevas órdenes hacen, / con que desórdenes quitan. / Y harán mal, cuando descansen / de las guerras, en sufrir / en sus villas y lugares / a hombres tan poderosos / por traer cruces tan grandes."

⁸ Por ejemplo: "—¿Y mi honra?—¿Qué más honra / que amarla el comendador?" (*S. J.*, acto I, esc. xxi.) Comp. *F. O.*, acto II, p. 61: "De cualquier suerte que sea / vuestras mujeres se honran."

⁹ No he podido hallar en *La Santa Juana* ningún pasaje copiado literalmente, pero esto no significa nada, porque Tirso era demasiado poeta para hacer una imitación servil.

¹⁰ "The historical elements of Lope de Vega's *Fuente Ovejuna*," reprinted from *PMLA.*, Sept. 1934, p. 667.

que fué escrita por los años de 1615 a 1618, basándose en los puntos de contacto que ofrece con otras comedias de esa época, y sobre todo en ciertas alusiones genealógicas. Esta bien fundada conjetura no destruye mi hipótesis, pues al fin la diferencia no pasa de dos o tres años, pero hace inverosímil que la comedia en cuestión se escribiera mucho antes. Por consiguiente, mientras no se demuestre lo contrario, creo que la fecha de *Fuente Ovejuna* debe fijarse hacia 1613, si no en ese mismo año.

J. ROBLES PAZOS

THE MOST DIFFICULT PASSAGE OF *DON QUIJOTE*

We are in the sixth chapter. They are about to burn Don Quijote's books! The priest and the barber are standing in judgment over the *Historia del famoso caballero Tirante el Blanco*, the former remarks that for its style it is the best book in the world, and adds, "Nevertheless, I tell you that he who composed it deserved to be thrown into the galleys for all the days of his life, for did he not produce all that nonsense intentionally?" The Spanish, which I quote from the critical edition of A. Hämel, reads as follows.

Con todo eso, os digo que merecía el que lo compuso (¿pues no hizo tantas necedades de industria?) que le echaran a galeras por todos los días de su vida.¹

Professor Hämel adds the modest note, *ich möchte die Leseart der Originale beibehalten und obige Interpunktion vorschlagen*.

When it first appeared in print the passage looked like this:

Con todo esso os digo, que merecía el que le compuso, pues no hizo tantas necedades de industria, que le echaran a galeras, por todos los días de su vida: Lleuadle a casa, etc.

This has been called "the most difficult passage in *Don Quijote*." It is probably no more than a case of inadequate punctuation, that is, inadequate judging by present day standards. Is this an isolated case? To find support for Professor Hämel's reading I have examined all the passages in *Don Quijote* now pointed as exclamations, and all pointed as questions, and have collated them with the

¹ *Don Quijote de la Mancha*, Kritische Ausgabe mit Kommentar in 5 Banden, besorgt von Adalbert Hämel, Halle (Saale), 1925, Band I, 53, 3-6.

original readings, using for this purpose facsimiles made by The Hispanic Society of America from Cuesta's first edition of the *Primera Parte* (Madrid, 1605) and from his first edition of the *Segunda Parte* (Madrid, 1615), and the modern edition of F. Rodríguez Marín in the *Clásicos Castellanos* (8 vols., Madrid, 1911-1913).

The phrase that has caused so much trouble is an exclamatory, or rhetorical, question, not meant to elicit information but to emphasize a point. Such may nowadays be enclosed between exclamation points. That the first printer would not have used the point we infer from the fact that the sign (!) occurs only three times in the first edition of 1605 and only three times in the first edition of the *Segunda Parte*. Four more passages (these in the *Segunda Parte*) are set off with an inverted small letter *i*, perhaps indicating a scarcity of the required sign in the printer's cases. In the first of these the inverted *i* is not separated from the foregoing word by the usual space between words. There are then in the original *Don Quijote* only ten passages punctuated as exclamations, all much longer and more emphatic than the one we are studying. These I have copied in Appendix I below. Is it not possible that the first readers (including the proof reader, if any) would have read the passage as exclamatory without sensing a difficulty, or feeling any need of other punctuation? The passage may be one of hundreds of others originally without an exclamation point.

As to the probability of a missing question mark, that too is great. In all of *Don Quijote* there are 234 passages that now carry question marks but were without them when they first appeared in print. Seventy-two of these are in the *Primera Parte*. In only about ten of these does the question seek for definite information, so that the absence of the point may be attributed to carelessness. The rest may be regarded as more or less exclamatory and their punctuation justified as in accord with the printer's system. The accuracy of this inference may be checked by examining the references I have given in Appendix II. In either case, carelessness or system, Professor Hämel's reading is strongly supported.

Space is lacking for examples from the different groups into which the unpunctuated questions of the original fall. Most numerous are exclamatory questions either affirmative or negatives; then, as a subdivision well represented, there are questions preceded or fol-

lowed by an exclamation; there are questions followed by an imperative, an imprecation, or a reason for asking; there are questions in which part of the interlocutor's question or statement is taken up (*e. g.*, What are we to do?—What?—said he); there is the type of rejecting question (*e. g.*, *Cómo ha de ser?*); and the what-do-you-mean-by type. All these are more or less exclamatory.

Our passage does not stand entirely alone in having missed the dress of modern punctuation. Rodríguez Marín says of the following one that *Clemencín y Cortejón omitieron indebidamente los signos admirativos*:

—Pues ¡es verdad—replicó don Quijote—que no acompaña esa grandeza y la adorna con mil millones de gracias del alma! III 134, 15-17, I, XXI.

The first edition has:

Pues es verdad, replicó don Quijote, que no acompaña essa grandeza, y la adorna con mil millones, y (sic) gracias del alma. 172 verso, 23-26.

To show how embarrassing to the present day reader the scanty punctuation of the original may be, I transcribe three passages from the original each followed by the same in modern dress:

Miente delante de mi, ruyn villano, dixo don Quixote: Por el sol. . . 12v2-3.

"¿Miente" delante de mí, ruin villano?—dijo don Quijote.—Por el sol. . . I 116, 5-6, I, LV.

Yrme yo con el, dixo el muchacho, mas mal año, no señor, ni por pienso: 12v28-29.

—¿Irme yo con él—dijo el muchacho—más? ¡Mal año! No, señor, ni por pienso; I 118, 16-17, I, IV.

Pero açotarme yo abernuncio. 137v27.

. . . pero ¡azotarme yo . . .? Abernuncio. VI 239, 25, II, XXXV.

APPENDIX I

All the passages containing an exclamation point in the first edition of *Don Quijote*.

Valame Dios, y quien será aquel que buenamente pueda contar aora, la rabia que entró en el coraçon de nuestro Manchego, viendose parar de aquella manera! Pt. I, Chap. IX, folio 33 verso, line 30—folio 34 recto, line 2.

O flor de la caualleria, que con solo vn garrotazo acabaste la carrera de tus tan bien gastados años! I, LII, 311v29-31.

O liberal sobre todos los Alexandros, pues por solos ocho meses de seruicio me tenias dada la mejor insula que el mar cife, y rodea! I, II, 312r3-5.

MOST DIFFICULT PASSAGE OF *DON QUIJOTE* 185

Santa Maria, y valme, este no es Tomê Cecial mi vezino, y mi compadre; II, XIII, 52r16-17.

Como, y es possible, que ay oy Caualleros Andantes en el mundo? y que ay historias impresas de verdaderas Cauallerias! II, XVI, 56r25-27.

a fuerça de la adulacion a quanto te estiendes, y quan dilatados limites son de tu jurisdiccion agradable! II, XVIII, 68r25-27.

A bodas de Camacho, y abundancia de la casa de don Diego, y quantas vezes os tengo de echar menos! II, XXIII, 93r5-7.

Crueldad notoria, dixo Sancho, dessagradecimiento inaudito: yo de mi sê dezir, que me rindiera, y me auassallara la mas minima razon amorosa suya, hideputa, y que coraçon de marmol, que entrañas de bronce, y que alma de argamasa! II, LVIII, 221r10-14.

Aqui si que fue el admirarse de nueuo: aqui si, que fue el erizarse los cabellos a todos de puro espanto! II, LXII, 240r26-27.

cabeça sabia, cabeça habladora, cabeça respondona, y admirable cabeça! II, LXII, 240r30-31.

APPENDIX II

References to passages now pointed as questions but without the question mark in the *princeps* edition, followed in each case by parallel references to the edition of Rodríguez Marín enclosed in parentheses:

12v2-3 (I 116, 5-6) 12v28-29 (I 118, 16-17) 14v6-8 (I 126, 13-15) 16r12-16 (I 136, 15-19) 17r5-7 (I 139, 14-140, 2) 19r32-v1 (I 153, 5-6) 21r6-10 (I 162, 4-163, 1) 23v7-8 (I 177, 2-4) 24r3-8 (I 179, 8-13) 25v3-4 (I 187, 11) 29v26-29 (I 206, 4-7) 35r22-25 (I 235, 19-20) 42v6-7 (I 261, 6-10) 47r30-47v9 (I 284, 18-285, 9) 59r31-v1 (II 1, 11-14) 60r1-3 (II 13, 7-9) 60r7-9 (II 13, 14-16) 64r30-32 (II 33, 4-8) 68r18-22 (II 49, 11-50, 4) 69r6-8 (II 52, 16-18) 69r11-13 (II 53, 3-6) 72v28-30 (II 67, 17-18) 75r10-12 (II 77, 22-24) 77v7-9 (II 89, 22-23) 78r3-5 (II 91, 18-20) 78r27-28 (II 93, 18-19) 78v27-28 (II 95, 13) 82r31-v1 (II 110, 6-7) 88r25-26 (II 138, 21) 95r16 ff. (II 168, 20 ff.) 100r20-23 (II 192, 11-14) 104r19-20 (II 215, 12-13) 104r30-31 (II 216, 12) 104v6-10 (II 236, 14-237, 4) 123r16-18 (II 290, 11-14) 123v13-14 (II 291, 22) 125r27-29 (II 301, 11) 130v11-14 (II 318, 14-319, 3) 131r8-9 (II 321, 1) 134v9-14 (II 334, 12-18) 141v3 ff. (II 21, 24 ff.) 144v30-145r1 (III 34, 3-10) 145r26-28 (III 35, 11-14) 149r3-6 (III 46, 4-7) 163r24-25 (III 94, 3-5) 171r2-3 (III 125, 3-4) 171r22-25 (III 217, 9-13) 172v23-26 (III 14-16) 174r23-25 (III 139, 15-140, 2) 175r31-v2 (III 143, 8-10) 176v10-12 (III 147, 15-16) 186r2-5 (III 183, 4-7) 188r31-v1 (III 192, 9-12) 203r9-10 (III 241, 5-8) 203v1-3 (III 242, 13-16) 208v10-13 (III 266, 1-3) 234r4-7 (IV 21, 16-22, 3) 252r19-22 (IV 86, 14-17) 262v13-17 (IV 123, 12-15) 264v6-9 (IV 129, 22-130, 3) 267v20-22 (IV 142, 9-11) 276v7-10 (IV 181, 5-7) 278r30-v3 (IV 187, 10-15) 280v11-16 (IV 196, 9-14) 288v6-10 (IV 212, 13-213, 4) 287v21-25 (IV 222, 9113) 294v30-295r3 (IV 252, 18-24) 300r21-300v4 (IV 275, 6-18) 300v8-32 (IV 276, 4-278, 7) 303r31-303v2 (IV 287, 5-288, 2) 308r9-13 (IV 309, 15-19) 310v11-15 (IV 314, 8-11.)

H. H. ARNOLD

The Pennsylvania State College

REVIEWS

The Works of Edmund Spenser, A Variorum Edition. Edited by EDWIN GREENLAW, CHARLES OSGOOD, FREDERIC MORGAN PADELFORD.

The Faerie Queene, Book Two. EDWIN GREENLAW, Special Editor assisted by RAY HEFFNER, JAMES G. MC MANAWAY, ERNEST A. STRATHMANN. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1933. Pp. x + 517. \$6.00.

The Faerie Queene, Book Three. FREDERICK MORGAN PADELFORD, Special Editor. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1934. Pp. viii + 432. \$6.00.

The second and third volumes of this invaluable work are continued on the lines of the first, reviewed in this periodical in April, 1933. If anything the work in the opinion of the present writer gains in interest as it proceeds. The first book has been made the subject of so much study that there was less that was unfamiliar and what there was not always attractive. These books have not been quite so frequently edited in separate volumes, and the notes and dissertations bring together much that, scattered through periodicals or theses, has not always attracted the attention of scholars other than specialists in Spenser.

The plan of the work is now well known and need not be dwelt on at length—the commentary on each successive canto, the various appendixes, and the final textual appendix followed by critical notes on the text, and a bibliography. What was said of the textual appendix in my review of the first book applies to these volumes so far as I have found time to check them. The text is practically identical with that of the Oxford edition. The record of variations in spelling and punctuation is fuller than that in the Oxford edition, and I have noticed but few, and those trifling, omissions. See I. lvi. 9 and lviii. 3 and 4. In the nine instances where a non-rhyming word has by chance been used for the rhyming word of the same meaning by Spenser, the editors have substituted the correct word in place of merely recording it. This was perhaps the right thing to do when the textual material is so far removed from the text itself and a reader cannot correct for himself by a glance at the notes in the foot of the page. In the enumeration of these nine places 2. 8. 29. 5. should read 7 for 5.

But the chief interest of this great edition lies in the commentary and the special appendixes. In the Second Book the latter deal with The Date of Composition, Historical Allegory, Moral Alle-

gory, The Virtue of Temperance, Spenser and Milton, the Morality Theme, Sources, Elizabethan Psychology, the structure of the poem, and the recondite twenty-second stanza of canto 9. On not all of these does the present writer feel able or desirous of commenting. What concerns every lover of Spenser's poetry is the right interpretation (so far as they can be interpreted) of the historical and the moral allegory. On the former the most valuable and interesting quotation is that from the late Professor Greenlaw's *Studies in Spenser's Historical Allegory*. Taken in this broad way and without any attempt to solve the cross-word puzzles (to use Greenlaw's own word) of personal identification, etc. the allegory gains a fresh interest even for one who finds allegory in general merely an intrusion in poetry. For thus seen the allegory of the second book is a statement of a cardinal principle in English policy, a fundamental trait in the English character, the love of the *via media*, of compromise, the distrust of "the dead reckoning of logic" being followed to its furthest extreme. It was the realisation of this which made Elizabeth the great Queen that she was. It was the failure to realise it which in the end was fatal both to Charles and Laud on the one hand and to the presbyterians and puritans on the other. The Restoration and the Revolution of 1688 were the affirmation of the same spirit. On the Moral Allegory and the Virtue of Temperance, which are parts of the same question, the best paper seems to me that by Viola Hulbert which modifies the interpretation of Spenser's doctrine of the mean as based on Aristotle by consideration of the mediaeval, Christian tradition. "The figures of Medina, Elissa and Perissa with Sans-loy and Hudibras are not the means and extremes of the Aristotelian temperance. Even if the Aristotelian temperance is made to include the Aristotelian continence it is still too narrow to cover the characteristics of these figures. The meeting of Guyon with Shamefastness gains meaning when one considers that Verecundia is an integral part of temperance in Christian ethics. "... Spenser's virtues are Christian virtues." Thus broadly taken the allegory becomes more vital, not a pedantic poetising of Aristotle after the manner of Stephen Hawes, but a vivid reflection of the spirit, of the Christian spirit, of Spenser's age.

Certainly the allegory is in the Second Book somewhat of a tough nut for the lover of poetry to crack. It is omnipresent and there is no real conflict to heighten the interest as in the First Book. The difficulty of harmonising moral and poetic effect could hardly be made more visible than in the two finest cantos of the poem, the descent of Guyon into the den of Mammon (Canto VII.) and the overthrow of Acrasia's Bower of Bliss in the last Canto (Canto XII.). The first of these has a splendid moral glow about it, but the impression is of a noble knight passing undismayed through threatening perils on every side (such as one might find in Southey's *Curse of Kehama*). There is no suggestion of tempta-

tion, of allurements despite the speeches of Mammon. The atmosphere of the whole is rather that of the descent of Aeneas to the lower world, from which some of the details are borrowed. The poetry here is all on the side of the virtue, the heroic virtue which, not so much tempted as threatened, passes on undismayed. If Mammon really wished to tempt he should surely have kept out of sight the "poor damned wights," Tantalus and Pilate. In the Bower of Bliss it is the other way about. The poetry is on the side of the alluring voices:

Eftsoones they heard a most melodious sound &c.

and the mode in which the lady and her lover are overcome is a little too reminiscent of the discovery in Homer of Mars and Venus, so favourite a subject with the Renaissance painters. Of the more pedantic development of the Allegory I need not say much, the House of Alma etc. I would rather call the reader's attention to Greenlaw's excellent essay on Spenser and Milton. He seems to me always to say the right thing e. g. again: "Archimago in this book is not primarily representative of the Jesuits, or even of Hypocrisy, as is often said; he stands for Satan. The source, I believe, is Tasso, particularly in the attempts made by him to create enmity between Arthur and Guyon . . . and in his employment of a beautiful witch, Duessa, as Tasso's Satan employs Armida. That Spenser has a Satan much like Milton's in mind is indicated by the statement 'For to all good he enemy was still,' and by the fact that he has escaped from confinement and fares forth to work mischief."

The sources are dealt with with all the exhaustiveness which one has come to expect in American work—sometimes perhaps with excessive detail, and not always with the attention needed to the work that was actually available at the time Spenser wrote. Such attention gives worth to Warton's note on Gelli's *Circe* translated in 1557, and to Lotspeich's on *Natalis Comes* (p. 376) and to the note of Miss Hulbert to which I have referred. In the main the right things are emphasised:—Ariosto, Tasso, the Chronicles and Spenser's interest in British and Tudor history on which Greenlaw had done such good work. In the Appendix on Elizabethan Psychology none of the critics has noticed that mediaeval doctrine of the memory was based ultimately on Aristotle's *περὶ μνήμης καὶ ἀναμνήσεως*. "Anamnestes" is not the "reminder" but rather the "recollector," recollection, what one does for oneself not what is done by another. Perhaps in this connection too much is made by Boughner of the fact that in Spenser's account reason comes between Phantastes (*φαντασία* is, by the way, more than imagination) and Eumnestes, but the suggestion is interesting. Some misprints may be noted: p. 416 where two lines from Harrison have been inverted; p. 423 "gables" for "cables"; 442, where a line has been left out in the stanza quoted; p. 201, where there are

some five small errors in the printing of the Greek, and some similar slips are to be noted at pp. 216, 224, 253, 254, 263; at 374 "siquic" should be "siquis" and at 390 "Idem quem" should be "Idem quom."

If the allegory is rather insistent in the Second Book it is with some relief to the reader, and probably to the poet, that in the third book this schematic treatment gave place to a freer handling, and story becomes a greater interest—story and variety of character. The suggestion of contemporary portraits and allusion to contemporary events is also stronger. Accordingly, in this volume, accompanying the commentary, we have appendixes of interest on the Plan and Conduct of Book Three, the source of Britomart, the Garden of Adonis, the Masque of Cupid, Spenser's debt to the Italian romances and his use of material drawn from this source, Historical Allegory, the Women of the Allegory a subject on which Dowden had written for Grosart what is reproduced here and Spenser's use of the Plastic Arts. The first of these absorbs the treatment of the Moral Allegory. Of this theme the fullest and most detailed discussion is that of Professor Padelford reproduced from his "Allegory of Chastity in the Faerie Queene" (pp. 367-81). No one who has not studied the question with the care of the author has the right to criticise this detailed argument. But to the present writer it does seem that the allegory thus abstractly analysed does not add to the interest of the poem, which is perhaps Spenser's fault not the critic's. Here again the broader treatment, represented by what De Selincourt has to say, is more conducive to a right appreciation of the poem on its spiritual side. It must always be remembered that an allegory of Chastity is an allegory of Love. True love and chastity for Spenser and Milton are inseparable, and accordingly Spenser's story becomes a consideration of the varied aspects of love and womanhood, and so it also falls into the stream of the mediaeval allegory represented preeminently by the Romance of the Rose. Not so much different types of women as different aspects of her character and charm are represented by Florimell and Amoret and Belphebe and the more all-inclusive Britomart. And one of the other chief interests of this Book and the next is the width of Spenser's view, more wide and vivid than always self-consistent. Thus a whole Appendix has been rightly given to the Garden of Adonis canto. For this it has always seemed to the present writer is the evidence that Spenser could see that love, however it behooves men to moralise and restrict it, is in itself a great, amoral, natural force. Professor Osgood has shown Spenser's debt to Lucretius but Spenser is not a Lucretian nor indeed any specific type of philosopher. He blends, as Saurat has pointed out in an article here summarised and cited, inconsistent ideas in a lyrical, sensuous description of Nature's procreative power free from all the inhibitions that he must insist on in the stories of

human love. Another Appendix deals fully with the sources and character of the other chief beauty of this book, the Mask of Cupid, which, as is justly pointed out by Greenlaw, is full of mediaeval elements drawn from the romances and treated, one might add, in the spirit of the Romance of the Rose. This is well supplemented by what Dodge has to show of the debt to the Italian romances.

The story of Amoret is one of the most delightful and at the same time one of the most difficult to interpret allegorically in the poem, for the allegory of love and chastity flows on easily, as the next book will show, into the allegory of friendship. Mr. Padelford's interpretation may be sound. If so it brings into sharp relief the opposition between the poetry of Spenser's romance and the prose of its allegoric interpretation. Is it conceivable that the beautiful verse with which the book originally ended:

Lightly he clipt her twixt her armes twaine &c.

describes the feelings with which Sir Scudamour welcomes the escape of his wife from all admixture of passion in her love for him? But it is hardly just to ask for too close a parallel between the story and its moral significance. Still the present writer has always felt that the story of Amoret, a more real person than Belpheobe who is simply a compliment to Elizabeth (if one may believe Ben Jonson, not too well deserved), is meant to suggest, not some inward imperfection of her life and character, but the solicitations and persecution to which one living the life of the Court was likely to be subjected: "I doubt," says Montaigne, "if the achievements of an Alexander or a Caesar surpass in difficulty the steadfastness of a handsome young woman, brought up after our fashion, in the open view and in contact with the world, assailed by so many contrary examples, keeping herself entire in the midst of a thousand powerful and persistent solicitations. . . And the vow of chastity is the most noble of all vows, as being the hardest." She is exposed, even after marriage, to the same temptations and trials as the maiden in Comus resists. Amoret has also resisted but it is with the aid of the more masculine Britomart that she is delivered. I may be wrong, but Mr. Padelford's interpretation does rather rob the story of its poetry. But indeed the difficulty of this kind of abstract allegory is only too fully illustrated by Spenser's pictures of the vices which are the opposite of the virtue he is extolling. Only a moralist could have told in such detail the story of Malbecco. In Florimel and the false Florimel we have the contrast which Spenser stresses in the Hymns between the beauty which is the index of beauty of character and that which is an illusion; in Amoret the perfect wife able to resist all solicitation if lacking the courage to repel all advances and deliver herself from her persecutors. "A gallant man" says Montaigne, "does not give up his pursuit for a refusal, provided it be a refusal of chastity not of choice. Though we swear and threaten and complain ever so much, we lie; we love

them the better for it. There is no greater allurements than a chastity that is not hard and forbidding." Britomart in whom all the virtues of other types are combined could not only resist but be, when needed, "forbidding."

It is difficult in a short review to do justice to all the wealth of material which the editors have brought together in these admirable volumes which, with all they contain, are yet so light to hold, so pleasant to use, as the edition of so delightful a poet should be. Two concluding remarks may be allowed, one is the sense of respect inspired by the notes of Upton who added to Jortin's classical knowledge an acquaintance also with the Italian romances. The other is one of profound regret that Greenlaw was not spared to complete his work on the Second Book.

H. J. C. GRIERSON

Edinburgh

The Axiochus of Plato Translated by Edmund Spenser. Edited by FREDERICK MORGAN PADELFORD. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1934. Pp. ix + 80. \$2.75.

If Fate had allowed us to call one of Spenser's lost works from the vasty deep, probably most of us would not have chosen his translation of the pseudo-Platonic *Axiochus*. However, any addition to the canon is welcome, and this work has considerable interest for the Spenserian student. It appears in an attractive volume, and Professor Padelford has spared no pains in furnishing a full and scholarly apparatus. Any account of the work must of necessity be a summary of his introduction. The story of its re-discovery, while not one of the romances of bibliography, is enough to set the fancy roaming, and one may recall J. C. (or must one say Sir John?) Squire's tale of the auction-room browser who found the *Hamlet* manuscript in the diary of Anne Hathaway! Although mentioned by eighteenth-century scholars, the *Axiochus* had disappeared by 1805, when Todd issued his edition of Spenser. In 1931 Professor Padelford acquired from Heffers a copy of the Spenser folio of 1679 which included a quarto edition of the *Axiochus*, printed by Cuthbert Burbie in 1592. The volume had come from a Shropshire library, but its history is unknown.

Professor Padelford thinks, for several good reasons, that the translation was an early work, done probably before *The Shepheardes Calender*, at any rate before Spenser left England in 1580. While this dialogue was very popular in sixteenth-century Europe, Spenser may have been led to it through Philippe de Mornay and Sidney; Mornay's French version was published in 1581, and he may have been at work on it while he was in England in 1577-78. However, Spenser's translation shows no indebtedness to Mornay's.

The editor has been able to prove "beyond any question" that Spenser used the Greek-Latin text of Rayanus Welsdalius (1568), "and that he relied upon the Latin rather than the Greek. This does not necessarily mean that he ignored the Greek which appeared in parallel columns, but there is not a single phrase or word in which he followed the original at the expense of the Latin." This is another bit of evidence against the notion that Spenser had any great knowledge of Greek. Professor Padelford adds much to the value of the book by reprinting the Greek and Latin texts.

Like most Elizabethans, Spenser seldom contents himself with one word when he can use two or three, and, like most writers of the sixties and seventies, he has a strain of Euphuism. But the translation is fluent, graceful, and sometimes eloquent, and even though not an original work it seems to reflect something of Spenser's mingled idealism and melancholy. Professor Padelford points out a number of parallels between its phrases and Spenser's verse, and it is of interest to see that many of the ideas, however commonplace, were among those that remained close to his heart. The translation may take a modest place among the rich meditations on mutability and death which were to multiply in the seventeenth century.

DOUGLAS BUSH

University of Minnesota

Edmund Spenser: A Critical Study. By B. E. C. DAVIS. Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan, 1933. Pp. ix + 267. \$3.00.

Mr. Davis has given us a very readable book and at times a stimulating one. Spenser is here considered, to quote from the preface (pp. vii-viii),

first as the new poet of that English Renaissance which sprang from the union of classical and medieval culture, secondly as the Poet's Poet, prescribing by example to his successors a grammar of poetry that has stood the test of time. [Mr. Davis continues:] If, as I believe, Spenser deserves recognition not merely as a weaver of fine phrases and fantasies but as a thinker and interpreter of his age, this was because the New Poet was also the Poet's Poet, or, in other words, through the creative influence of Humanism upon an individual poetic genius.

Here then is an answer to those critics who see in Spenser only a series of pretty pictures and those who characterize his philosophy, aside from his "borrowed platonism," as "trite, tame, shallow, nerveless." Of course, Spenser cannot be counted as one of "the philosophers"; his ideas were borrowed, as were the ideas of all his contemporaries. But he does mirror the thought of his age in all its

diversity. Mr. Davis insists, and I think rightly, on the influence of Lucretius and Ovid as well as of Plato and Aristotle, of the "Atheistic" school of Raleigh and the Kabbala as well as of the Bible and Protestant theology. His was a restless and inquiring mind, if not an inventive one, ever exploring the writings and thoughts of others, even of the detested Irish bards. Because he did not accept wholeheartedly the scepticism of Lucretius is no indication that he did not read Lucretius and was not profoundly stirred by his reading. That he could have found most of the ideas in his Garden of Adonis passage in Ovid has been pointed out long ago, but there is nothing in Ovid, or in Golding's translation, to stimulate Spenser and to invoke that profound questioning which is evident in the "Cantos of Mutabilitie." To question Spenser's knowledge of Lucretius seems to me absurd in the extreme; he must have *known* Lucretius. (See his translation of Lucretius, i, 1-23 in *F. Q.* iv, x, 44-7.) If he knew him, why is it considered necessary to deny him use of the ideas he found there? Although Mr. Davis does not discuss the recent attacks on the late Professor Greenlaw's theory of Lucretian influence, his final chapter, and indeed most of his book is an effective answer to those critics who cannot find it in their hearts to believe that gentle Spenser was ever tainted by the sceptical ideas of that "aetheistical Machieval," Lucretius. Spenser, and Mr. Davis insists (p. 211), was "a serious thinker striving earnestly through reading and observation to formulate a criticism of life." To his contemporaries he was the "learned poet," and to Milton, the "sage and serious Spenser."

The chapters on "Humanism," "Romance," and "Allegory" (III-V) present the many-sidedness of Spenser. They have for their theme the fusing of old story and symbolism with the spirit of the Elizabethan age and the making of a new epic of Humanism. There is nothing new in these chapters, but they are well written and make stimulating reading. Mr. Davis is unacquainted with the more recent views on Spenser's political and historical allegory; he neglects altogether, for example, the work of C. Bowie Millican and the late Professor Greenlaw on the Arthurian background of the *Faerie Queene*. His statement (p. 106) that the political allegory is "only surface deep" is the result of his failure to read these two recent studies. As a result, he fails to differentiate between the broad political intention, as Professor Greenlaw explains it in his *Studies in Spenser's Historical Allegory*, and the minute matching of patterns of the crossword-puzzle school. There is a real distinction between topical allusion and Spenser's evident intention to celebrate Elizabeth in a truly national epic, to set forth allegorically the greatness of her reign and the high destiny of her people. It was that allegory, of which the philosophical or moral allegory was a part, which was Spenser's primary concern. To neglect the political allegory, then, is to neglect Spenser's very purpose in writing his epic.

A student of Spenser will find little that is new to him in the chapters on "Diction," "Imagery," "Verbal Music, Verse" (VI-VIII), but his appreciation will be heightened by Mr. Davis' analysis.

As if to forestall some such criticism as that which follows, Mr. Davis says of his chapters on the "Life and Works" (I-II): "I make no claim to have discovered fresh biographical material, and question whether many more particulars of importance are now available." (p. viii.) I cannot accept this excuse. It should be the duty of every writer of even a "biographical sketch" of Spenser at least to check the information which he passes on. Mr. Davis not only fails to give anything new in his "Life," but he perpetuates a great many of the old errors. See, for example, his repetition (p. 31) of the statement that Spenser received a grant of the lands of Kilcolman on June 27, 1586. There is not a shred of evidence to support such a statement; it had its origin in an error in Carpenter's *Reference Guide* and is repeated by Miss Henley and Mr. Davis. A visit to the exhibition room of the Public Record office in London—only a short distance from Cambridge—would have given Mr. Davis the facts. His account of the quarrel with Lord Roche (pp. 49-50) is but one more example of Mr. Davis' failure to get at the facts.

A great deal of new material on Spenser's life awaits the researcher with the time and industry to search it out. At the Public Record office in London, for example, are many unnoticed references to the poet—some of little moment and others of great importance. In fact, any new information concerning a major poet, about whom we know as little as we do about Spenser, is important. The following entries in the Wage Book¹ for Ireland (1584-5) are an example of what can be found if sought.

He [Nicholas Dawtrye, Seneshall of Clandeboyel] is further owinge to . . . Edmonde Spencer² p bill dated xxij^{do} Augustij 1582 signed to Walter Sedgrave . . . xiiij^{li} vjs viiij^d.

Edw: Barkley esquier constable of Askeatin . . . He owethe and is indebted viz. . . . to Edmunde Spencer³ by bill of the firste of februaryj 1584 . . . vij^{li}.

Captaine Garrat fitz Garret . . . He oweth and is indebted viz. . . . to . . . Edmunde Spencer⁴ p pst bill xiiij^{do} Sept. 1581 . . . iiij^{li} viij^s ster fac ir . . . cxvijs iiij^d.

I cannot show here the importance of these entries, but they may, upon further study and research, cast some light upon Spenser's whereabouts and occupation between 1581 and 1584. The more

¹ SP., 67. 11 (*Irish Folios*, 11, P. R. O.).

² Fol. 40r. Dawtrye's name appears on fol. 39v.

³ Fol. 45v. Entered also in "A Coppye of ye Reeknyng of Captaine Edward Barkeley," SP., 63. 117, item 25, p. 361.

⁴ Fol. 49v.

details of this nature we unearth the more we know about Spenser. We need very badly a new life of Spenser, but that life must be based on a careful and systematic checking of all documents known to relate to Spenser as well as upon the new material that *can* be found.

The one great fault of this book is that it neglects most of the recent articles on Spenser in the learned journals. This neglect may be deliberate on Mr. Davis' part, or it may be the result of his naïve assumption (p. vii) that "materials . . . within the confines of periodicals" are beyond the pale. Despite these objections, as I have indicated before, there is much to recommend Mr. Davis' book not only to Spenser scholars but also to those who "just don't read Spenser."

RAY HEFFNER

The Johns Hopkins University

Translations from the Classics into English from Caxton to Chapman, 1477-1620. By HENRY BURROWES LATHROP. (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, Number 35.) Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1933. Pp. 350. \$2.00.

No aspect of his complex subject eludes Professor Lathrop. While he attempts no survey of continental editing and translating of the classics, that background gives almost unfailing precision to his study of the English translations. Somewhere on his big canvas he has represented virtually every work and every author to be found in his appendices, which list all the known translations chronologically and the translators alphabetically. Perspective cannot be perfect in a study whose scale permits quotations of more than a page from John Harington "the elder's" dedication of his *De Amicitia* to a dowager Duchess of Suffolk and from Wilson's dedication of his Demosthenes to Cecil. Yet there is no confusion. Professor Lathrop closes his book with a critical bibliography no less discriminating than extensive, and he focuses almost every ray of the light—sometimes clarifying and sometimes distorting—which scholarship has thrown upon both his woods and his trees.

Individual translations—their genesis, their bibliographical problems, and their literary interpretation—are his keenest interest. It is only to indicate broad and obvious differences in the landscape that he divides his field into four periods. He refuses to hypostatize Translation as an organic phenomenon in itself. Significantly, the last four pages of his very long chapter on the third period (1557-1593) systematically refute Professor C. H. Conley's treat-

ment¹ of the gentlemen translators of Elizabeth's youth, most of them members of the Inns of Court, as a company working with the countenance of liberal statesmen in a self-conscious attempt to hoist medieval obscurantism in Church and State with the classical petard. The rebuttal of Professor Conley's strained evidence is complete, but it betrays a certain indifference to the part played by the classics in the philosophical ferment of the time. Less conspicuously the same indifference appears in Professor Lathrop's handling of the classical factor in the "atheism" of Marlowe and Raleigh. In that connection his oversight of Mr. George T. Buckley's *Atheism in the English Renaissance*, which opens with an admirable chapter on "The Classical Sources," is one of his very few bibliographical omissions. This blind spot, however, is venial, for—ethics apart—the philosophical importance of the classics which were translated was secondary. Englishmen, Professor Lathrop believes, took what they craved from the classics, and what they most craved after Elizabeth's accession was food for the adventurous and amatory imagination. His thesis is the familiar one which Professor Walter Schirmer has developed² in connection with Shakespeare's decorative and undogmatic use of mythology, but his examination of works like Turberville's *Heroides* and Underdowne's *Ibis* reilluminates the context of Ovid's contribution "to give Shakespeare's writing its peculiar atmosphere of romance." The romantic thesis, however, is not permitted to dominate even the third chapter. Full justice is done to works as diverse as Savile's Tacitus and Billingsley's Euclid, while the entire volume recognizes the perennial influence of William Baldwin's *Moral Philosophy*. By an odd slip, Baldwin, a final allusion to whose work closes the book, is mentioned in both text (p. 74) and index as James, but the name is given correctly in the list of translators and in the reference to W. F. Trench's article, "William Baldwin,"³ in the bibliography.

Professor Lathrop's greatest general interest is in the relation of the classics and their translation to English prose. Quotations from many a preface display the conscious efforts to approximate English style to divers Greek and Latin originals. Copious extracts illustrate the progress toward the "somewhat Stoic type of rhetoric" of Cheke, Ascham, and Wilson and enable us to understand why "the work of Brende marks a new stadium in the same course . . . ; and Grimald's Cicero sets a new standard of energetic precision and of the effort to deal with fairly refined distinctions in a prose that strives for literary finish." For the analysis of the style of the professional translators of the fourth period (1593-

¹ In *The First English Translators of the Classics*. New Haven, 1927.

² In *Antike, Renaissance und Puritanismus*. Second edition, Munich, 1933.

³ *Mod. Quart. of Lang.*, I, 259.

1620) and of North the allowance of space is almost as generous as it is in Mr. F. O. Matthiessen's much more specialized study of North and Holland.⁴ There is little to choose between the two studies of the style of North. Professor Lathrop exhibits just those colloquial and concretely imaginative elements in North's Plutarch for which "Amyot would not quite have approved of his translator." In that style he makes us see the right medium for the "spirit and artistic ideals of Plutarch," which "are those of tragic drama." His handling of individual achievements in style is, perhaps inevitably, more successful than his treatment of the general problem. With characteristic aversion from theories that bring false harmony into the facts Professor Lathrop puts his emphasis upon such incongruities as Adlington's toning down of Apuleius' extravagance and Pettie's "euphuizing" of his much homelier classical material. Anent euphuism, although he recognizes that Lyly's "work is full of borrowings from antiquity, most interestingly from Isocrates," he insists that the peculiar features of that style "are the development not of classical but of medieval methods and ideas." He makes no reference to Pater's discussion in *Marius, the Epicurean* of the essence of which both Apuleius and Lyly were in pursuit. Insistence that "Apuleius was no more and no less a foreigner than other provincials, than Seneca the Spaniard, or Ausonius the Gaul," and "wrote—though in an extreme form—the fashionable style of baroque rhetoric," seems rather to oversimplify the problem of *Africatas*, as the humanists called that baroque style. "M. Norden," as M. Pierre Médan reminds us,⁵ "a raillé sans pitié, avec plus de mordant que de finesse, les partisans de l'*Africatas*." For M. Médan "une conception stylistique spéciale à l'Afrique romaine n'est pas niable."⁶ For the man who happened to English Apuleius his private variety of *Africatas* had many objections and small charm, but that historical accident cannot have deceived the few sensitive Elizabethans who read him in the original about his prosperous pursuit of the will-o'-the-wisp after which they were stumbling with Lyly.

A part of the author's task in this book must inevitably be the correction of many sins of omission and commission. Professor Lathrop's zeal in this matter deserves gratitude; conspicuously his notes on Miss Henrietta Palmer's *List of English Editions and Translations of Greek and Latin Classics Printed before 1641*, his completely documented challenge of Professor W. H. Woodward's assertion in *The Cambridge History of English Literature*⁷ that

⁴ In *Translation, an Elizabethan Art*.

⁵ *La Latinité d'Apulée dans les Métamorphoses*, Paris, 1926, p. 319.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 321.

⁷ P. 309. I find Professor Woodward's remark in Vol. III, Chap. xix, p. 482, of the reissue of *The Cambridge History*, not "at the end of chapter four," where Professor Lathrop locates it.

during the period under review "in Greek, not one of the translators, Savile excepted, but works through a French version like North," and his transfer of credit for Shakespeare's cannibals from Raleigh (and Montaigne?) to Pliny. His evidence of Grimald's source for the *Death of Zoroas* and *Marcus Tullius Ciceroes Death* in Beza's poems, which were published in 1548, seems to restore to Surrey the priority in blank verse which Professor Berdan once questioned. Doubtless he will carry most students with him in his attack upon the many too sweeping claims which have been made for Senecan influence upon Elizabethan drama, but he regards one of those claims as more absolute than it is when he quotes Professor Grierson as crediting "Seneca with being the source not only of the formula of Elizabethan drama, but also of the spirit which inspired it; the formula, namely, of crime and the nemesis that overtakes it." Professor Grierson's context in *Cross Currents in English Literature of the Seventeenth Century* deals precisely with those religious and ethical preoccupations of the English mind with which Senecan influence combined. Who can say definitely what was the importance of the Roman reagent in the resulting chemical change?

In his minor corrections Professor Lathrop is not always happy. Miss Foxwell might be absolved for having "spoken hastily" in her edition of Wyatt of *If thou wilt mighty be, flee from the rage* as "entirely founded upon Chaucer," especially since Mr. Tillyard's notes on the poem indicate its Boethian source. The two corrections made of Caxton's translations from the French seem to me unnecessary. *Fardoit sa crueuse face* may be too freely rendered as *clensyd his cruel face*, but I can find no authority for rendering *crueuse* as Professor Lathrop does, to mean *wrinkled*. In such matters the quality of mercy is not strained.

MERRITT Y. HUGHES

University of California

Surrey's Fourth Booke of Virgill Edited with Introduction, Variant Readings, and Notes. By HERBERT HARTMAN. New York: Oxford University Press, 1932. Pp. xxviii + 54 + 38 facsimiles. \$4.50.

Francis Meres's Treatise, "Poetrie," a Critical Edition. By DON CAMERON ALLEN. University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, vol. xvi, nos. 3-4. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1933. Pp. 158. \$1.50.

The gratitude of scholars is due to Professor Hartman, the editor, and to Mr. Carl H. Pforzheimer, the patron, for their

luxurious edition of the Day-Owen text of Surrey's Fourth Book of Vergil. The work includes a photographic facsimile of the original, a reprint of the text in modern type, with discriminating critical notes, and a concise but informative introduction, dealing skilfully with the somewhat difficult bibliographical problems of the Day-Owen text, giving the evidence that of all extant texts this is the closest to Surrey's own manuscript, characterizing Surrey's meter, and arguing that Surrey owed little if anything to Douglas or Italian translators. Upon this last point the evidence adduced is cogent but not conclusive. The case is not closed by declaring, however truly, that to Surrey Vergil's Latin would have been easier than Douglas's Scots or Liburnio's Italian; for Surrey's problem was not merely to give the sense of his original, but to develop a poetic style energetic, dignified, and graceful—to lay the foundations of English heroic verse. To achieve that end he might well have taken hints from many sources. It still remains for some one with skill and patience to compare Surrey line by line with all possible sources from which he might have drawn suggestions. As one who has readily accepted the scanty evidence of Surrey's debt to Douglas, Piccolomini, and Liburnio, I admit that I expect from such a study full confirmation of Professor Hartman's contention, but the task has still to be completed.

Mr. Allen's edition includes a careful reprint of the section on "Poetrie" from the first edition of Meres's *Palladis Tamia*, and a good account of the bibliography. This introduction demonstrates with the polemic zeal and ruthless thoroughness of a doctor's thesis that Meres, coming at an era of decay in English education, had been demoralized by the practice of *imitatio*, by a system of education which "sanctions a method . . . little better than plagiarism," that he has no ideas of his own, and merely reproduces the comments of other critics, borrowing his comments on classical and neo-classical authors mainly from Ravisius Textor, and on Englishmen from Ascham, Webbe, Nash, Puttenham, and Sidney. The notes cite Meres's sources in detail. I should not have supposed that this exposé was needed to put Meres in his place, for I had the impression that practically all competent scholars regarded him as a dull man mechanically parroting the opinions of others; but when Mr. Allen has done with him he is not merely a plucked chicken, but a wraith. There is another side, however, to the method of *imitatio*. Energetic minds are sometimes stimulated by a generous emulation to equal and even to surpass their models. So it was with some of the classicists, for example, Benjamin Jonson, Milton, Pope, and Samuel Johnson. Burns surpassed but systematically imitated the earlier Scottish song writers. Wordsworth challenged Milton in his sonnets, Tennyson is an abundant imitator, and so is Mr. T. S. Eliot; and all these men are not least original when most imitative. After all, did his imitation

harm Meres? He never would have had anything of his own to say, so that the very unoriginality of his patient collecting makes him the better witness to the judgment of qualified critics in his era.

H. B. LATHROP

University of Wisconsin

Art and Artifice in Shakespeare. By ELMER EDGAR STOLL.
Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: The Macmillan Company, 1933. Pp. xv + 178. \$2.50.

Professor Stoll's latest addition to his voluminous work on Shakespearean criticism and interpretation has been received with high, not to say enthusiastic, applause abroad. Whether it will add many cubits to his stature as a judge and a master in this country seems open to very considerable doubt. The reason, of course, is that his real service to the understanding of Shakespeare's plays has long been recognized in this country; apparently it is just being discovered abroad.

What that service is can be put very simply: he has insisted for years in lectures, articles, and books that Shakespeare's plays are plays, not transcripts from life, and that the attempt to interpret Shakespeare's characters by the method of modern psychology or to measure them by the standards of modern realism leads inevitably to erroneous conclusions. And his work has been in the main successful. The old romantic school of interpretation which culminated in the work of Bradley is passing from the scene. No Shakespearean scholar today is likely to discuss the youth of Shakespeare's heroines or to inquire into the nature of Hamlet's studies at Wittenberg. Yet in this book Professor Stoll too often seems to play the part of Alexander at Persepolis who

Fought all his battles o'er again;
And thrice he routed all his foes, and thrice he slew the slain.

Along with this repetition of the old there is a somewhat surprising neglect of the new. No attention is paid for example to Baldwin's important work on the contribution of his player-colleagues to Shakespeare's plays or to the latest English and American textual critical studies. To state as he does (p. 7) that *Lear* immediately precedes *Othello*, though he instantly adds, "or succeeds," is to disregard the latest and best chronology of Shakespeare's plays. To call *Hamlet* a play "not published with the author's consent and in both Quartos garbled" (p. 109) is to fly in the face of the best textual criticism of the day. Evidence of "garbling" in the second Quarto would, I venture to say, be somewhat difficult to produce. All this accords, unhappily, with

the author's disdain, to use no harsher word, of his fellows in the field of Shakespearean studies. "Clutton-Brock cannot or will not read Shakespeare's score, Mr. Knight cannot or will not read the text. He reads the letters only." (p. 31 n.) Strong flavor of the *furor academicus*, such as we are more apt to associate with the work of German than English-speaking scholars, unfortunately permeates too much of *Art and Artifice*.

We may admit at once that Mr. Stoll's main contention is true, that Shakespeare's plays start from "postulates," that we must accept and employ "conventions" that modern rationalism discards in literature as in life. Yet he hurts his case again and again by over-insistence on these points, by suppression of facts, and even by a wresting of the text. He seems at least to ignore the fact that Shakespeare over and over does his best to make the incredible "postulate" plausible. The device of the caskets in the *Merchant of Venice* is an "improbable postulate" taken over from the source; but Shakespeare adds that the deviser, Portia's father, was "ever virtuous; and holy men at their deaths have good inspirations" and therefore that the right choice will never be made but by "one who shall rightly love," not as in Mr. Stoll's words by the "cleverest at conundrums" (p. 159). He overlooks or minimizes the choleric nature of King Lear—"irascibility" is Stoll's word—but Lear's outburst of wrath against his faithful Kent is Shakespeare's invention—there is nothing like it in the old play—invented no doubt to make more credible his treatment of Cordelia. Now Wrath is one of the Seven Deadly Sins and Lear's redemption is not accomplished till his soul is purged of Wrath and filled with Love. It is however, in his treatment of the "believed-slander convention" in *Othello* that Mr. Stoll does most violence to the text. After all Iago is not to Othello, "a stranger" (p. 17) but his old companion in arms

of whom his eyes had seen the proof
At Rhodes, at Cyprus, and on other grounds.

Iago's report of Cassio's behavior is not altogether "false" (p. 29) and is introduced by Shakespeare—it is not found in Cinthio—to render more credible Othello's belief of what is a false report in the next act. Mr. Stoll speaks slightly of the "loss of a handkerchief" and remarks that "the husbands and wives that we know" would not take it very seriously (p. 42 n). But it is not a handkerchief, but *the* handkerchief, a love-talisman, Othello's first gift to his wife. A modern husband would have to have unbounded faith in his wife—or in himself—to hear untroubled that she had given such a token to a gallant and amorous young officer. And all these details are invented by Shakespeare to add realism and plausibility to the "convention."

In the chapter on *Hamlet* Mr. Stoll renews his attack upon what

seems to him a figment of romantic criticism, the irresolute procrastinating Prince of Coleridge and Goethe, the melancholiac of Bradley. All very well, but one would imagine that this ghost had been well laid by this time; and Mr. Stoll's brave young prince, heroic and successful revenger, seems sadly short of a full and rounded portrait. Hamlet is scholar and courtier as well as soldier; his taste in drama marks him as a scholar in Sir Philip Sidney's school; his advice to the players, a scene that Stoll could dispense with (p. 50) marks him as a courtly Elizabethan lover of the drama. When Mr. Stoll declares (p. 130) that for the rant of Hamlet and Laertes at Ophelia's grave "there can be no excuse for the Prince but the one—which the dramatist gives him afterwards and for Laertes, none whatever," the reader, or at least this reviewer, wonders whether the author is not deserting his own central principle that Shakespeare cared more for situation than for character. Here certainly is a highly emotional, effective theatrical situation. Has it ever been omitted in the many stage versions of *Hamlet*? It might even be possible to show that the behavior of the two young men was in thorough accord with their characters as previously revealed by the poet-playwright. But such an attempt would outrun the limits of a review already too long.

A word must be said in closing on the composition in general and the style in particular of the book. Mr. Stoll announces it as a synthesis of his "opinions concerning Shakespeare's central structure" (p. 4). To the reviewer it seems not so much a synthesis as a conglomeration of old and new, long extracts from earlier work, repeated references to earlier work not always readily accessible—once indeed to an unpublished article (p. 85 n.) an intercalated chapter on Drama, Epic and Novel, and a last note on Chaucer's *Troilus and Cressida*. One would express the hope that this, Mr. Stoll's latest, is not his last book on Shakespeare. A true synthesis of his many fruitful years of study, purged of the bitterness of controversy, and free from the repellant dogmatism which mars this book, would indeed be welcome. And when it comes may we hope that this great scholar will pay a little more attention to the language in which his final synthesis is presented. Too often sentences, paragraphs even, of *Art and Artifice*, read as if they were written to be spoken in a lecture room where the speaker's voice and manner of delivery puts over what would puzzle the unaided reader. Tangled sentences interrupted by parentheses, inverted clauses, omissions and substitutions are all too common. Professor Stoll's learning like that of the late Professor Saintsbury is far-reaching and profound, but that is hardly an excuse for his writing in Saintsbury's exasperating manner.

T. M. PARROTT

Princeton University

Christopher Marlowe in London. By MARK ECCLES. Harvard Studies in English, X. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1934. Pp. vi + 185. \$2.50.

Curiosity concerning the life of Christopher Marlowe can hardly be said to have existed before the nineteenth century, except for fitful flashes of it in the mind of Edmund Malone. So little was really known of him as recently as 1819 that one scholar gravely explained 'Marlowe' as merely a *nom de guerre* assumed by Shakespeare during his apprentice period in the theatres. The accretion of biographical material that began with Dyce's memoir in 1850 (the first account of the author that could at all be called a 'life') was considerable; but the mainly casual discoveries of three generations of litterateurs paled in the light of Mr. Hotson's brilliant search of Record Office documents ten years ago.

This generation had little right to expect another spark from heaven to fall, and cynics will be disposed either to exclaim upon Mr. Eccles' luck or to revile the sloth of his predecessors for leaving him such extraordinary pickings. Extraordinary they are indeed, and richly deserved, for the method of Mr. Eccles is that of his friend Mr. Hotson and they have generously supplemented each other's resources.

Future biographers of Marlowe will know that Marlowe was a close friend of Thomas Watson, the poet-scholar (whom Mr. Eccles' publisher foully miscalls 'Washburn' in the jacket-notice of the book); that they were comrades in a street brawl that led to the death of one William Bradley at Watson's hands, for which fact both poets went for a time to Newgate Prison. They will understand, as no one has hitherto, the background and reason of the bond which Marlowe and his two sureties delivered on October 1, 1589 for Marlowe's appearance at the Newgate Gaol Delivery, and they will be obliged to include among Marlowe's works the Latin dedication of Watson's posthumous *Amintae Gaudia* to the Countess of Pembroke (in 1592), which bears the signature, 'C. M.'

Still more important for the reconstruction of Marlowe's life in London is Mr. Eccles' discovery of his local habitation. It was Norton Folgate at the time of Bradley's death in 1589 and was still in the same immediate neighborhood at least in 1592, when a recognizance which Mr. Eccles has found in the Middlesex Guildhall, Westminster, shows Marlowe giving bond for his appearance at the next general session of the peace and pledging himself meantime to innocuous conduct toward the constable and sub-constable of Holywell-street. Norton Folgate and Holywell-street were very close to each other, if not alternative designations of the same district, which was also very close to the Theatre and Curtain

playhouses and the actors' church of St. Leonard's, Shoreditch. Mr. Eccles reminds us of Beeston's report that Shakespeare lived also in Shoreditch and shows cause for believing that his residence there was contemporary with Marlowe's.

It would not be fair to the reader, and it would be impossible in the limits of a review, to record all the new information that Mr. Eccles' prosperous industry has assembled. It is admirably and excitingly set forth in the book. The effect of the new light upon our personal judgment of Marlowe must be confessed to be meliorative. Considered absolutely, the causes both of his incarceration in Newgate and of his death are much less sulphurous than the imaginations of twenty years ago were apt to conceive them; considered relatively to what the records tell us of the ordinary chances of Elizabethan life, they lose still more of the sinister distinction which the clergymen-editors of the Victorian era tended to give them. Not only Marlowe and Ben Jonson, we now know, but the honey-tongued John Day and the pastoral Porter figured (and more than once) in fatal brawls. If Shakespeare has not yet been shown to have effectively wielded lethal arms, we do know that a man swore to the Southwark police that he went in deadly fear of him; and the things which Mr. Eccles has elsewhere divulged about that 'exquisite' author of *Parthenophil*, Barnabe Barnes, make mere homicide look prosaic.

TUCKER BROOKE

Yale University

Jean Regnaud de Segrais, l'homme et son œuvre. Par WESSIE M. TIPPING. Paris: les Editions Internationales, 1933. Pp. 261.

It was an interesting idea to have made a study of Segrais, on whom nothing of importance has been written since the publication in 1863 by Brédif, *Segrais, sa vie et ses œuvres*, a rather dry and inaccessible work, containing many gaps and inaccuracies. Thus the author of the present volume, thanks to careful research among the papers of Pierre Carel in the municipal library at Caen, is able to give a detailed account of Segrais' life, hitherto only vaguely known. She also corrects many errors made by Brédif in regard to his works. In fact, at every step in her study she gives proof of careful erudition which never becomes pedantic. Her twenty-three page bibliography testifies to her conscientious research. Her style is remarkably pure, with scarcely a phrase to betray the fact that French is not her native language.

If Miss Tipping wisely does not overestimate the literary value of Segrais' works, she does realize the keen interest attached to a study of his milieu and in a most delightful fashion introduces the reader to the intimate life of the brilliant period which he

traversed. We see him as the "Voiture caennais" of the Hôtel de Rambouillet, as a member of the "Ordre des Chevaliers de la Moquette" of the comtesse de Fiesque, and as a constant friend of the Scarron household. A vivid picture is given of the capricious Mlle de Montpensier, whose discreet collaborator he was. We become familiar with Mme de Lafayette's circle of friends. We follow Segrain to the French Academy and to the academy at Caen. A few interesting details are given about the latter, one of the most illustrious of the provincial academies, to judge from its eminent members, but about whose early years, curiously enough, very little is known.

Miss Tipping recognizes the historical importance of Segrain's works. His *poèmes galants* written at Saint-Fargeau are a gallery of portraits of the noted folk who surrounded la Grande Made-moiselle and a mirror of the diversions of her court. His *Eglogues*, admired by the critical Boileau and by Victor Hugo, revived in France the bucolic genre introduced half a century earlier by Racan, and paved the way for Chénier. A valuable appendix to the Segrain publishes, among many poems which have not been included in any edition of Segrain's works, his eighth *Eglogue*, a eulogy of the princesse de Bavière. His most important contribution is his *Nouvelles Françaises*, which contains an entire code of rules out of which the modern novel was to develop. This chapter of Miss Tipping's book is all the more important since the *Nouvelles* are very rare and difficult to obtain for first hand reading. With sure judgment and in an alert style, she analyzes them, maliciously pointing out their weaknesses, as well as dwelling on their merits. One of them, *Eugénie*, before Mme de Lafayette made it her favorite theme, dealt with the sentimental life of a married woman.

If in her study of the relations between Segrain and Mme de Lafayette, the author concludes that he had very little share in the latter's works, she does insist, nevertheless, on the fact that by his theories on the *nouvelle*, Segrain paved the way for Mme de Lafayette, and that is no mean merit. In fact, the weakness of the book is that a more detailed study could have been made of the development of Mme de Lafayette's novel through the *nouvelle* of Segrain. However, that would have required a different approach to the subject.

MARY ELIZABETH STORER

Beloit College

BRIEF MENTION

Spenser in Southern Ireland. By A. C. JUDSON. Bloomington, Indiana: The Principia Press, 1933. Pp. 60. Mr. Judson's book is not a biographical study as its title might seem to indicate but a story of the author's visit to the Spenser country in Southern Ireland. His unassuming text with its charming illustrations has the happy effect of taking the poet for a moment out of the library in which our higher scholarship has so much the habit of finding him and leaving him. In the pursuit of our studies we are in some danger of forgetting that Spenser like his master Chaucer was a lover of nature as well as of books. Of this tendency Mr. Judson's essay is a welcome corrective. In the pursuit of his pleasant form of research the author has glimpsed through the veil of the poet's myth and allegory Spenser's accurate observation of the rivers and mountains about his castle home.

A Critical Bibliography of the Works of Edmund Spenser Printed before 1700. (A Publication of the Tudor and Stuart Club.) By FRANCIS R. JOHNSON. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1933. Pp. xiv + 62. \$2.75. In this bibliography of Spenser Mr. Johnson has undertaken a meticulous description of all editions of the poet's works that appeared prior to the eighteenth century. This includes in each case a transcript of the title page, an itemization of contents, an account of format, collation, and running-title, and a notation of the entry in the Stationers' Register. Where the copy used has a colophon, this is duly described, and in some cases it has been found necessary to comment upon foliation, pagination, water-marks, and the quality of the paper used. These summary descriptions are supplemented with notes which furnish further pertinent information and deal succinctly with controversial questions.

In preparing his bibliography Mr. Johnson has depended particularly upon the excellent Spenser collection in the Tudor and Stuart Club Library at Johns Hopkins University. However, he has had the use of copies treasured elsewhere; *e. g.*, the Huth-Clawson *Shepheardes Calender* of 1579, the Britwell copy of the Spenser-Harvey letters (1580), and the Boston Public Library *Daphnaida* (1591). The bibliography does not attempt a complete census of copies, but many other copies than the one used are recorded and in some instances an estimate made of the total number in existence. Furthermore, there are included comparative studies of the copies consulted. While Mr. Johnson does not pretend to have covered the whole field of the early copies he has clearly covered the signi-

ficant part of it, and it would certainly have been unwise for him to delay the publication of his invaluable book until he had made more extensive researches. Not only bibliographers but investigators of literary problems, which nowadays so often include bibliographical questions, will find his book indispensable. The interest and attractiveness of the publication are enhanced by the reproduction of as many as eleven title-pages.

H. S. V. JONES

University of Illinois

Sir Thomas Wyatt and Some Collected Studies. By E. K. CHAMBERS. London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1933. Pp. vii + 228. 7/6 net. This volume includes four essays previously published: "Some Points in the Grail Legend," "Sir Thomas Malory," "Some Aspects of Medieval Lyric," and "The English Pastoral"; two new essays, "Sir Thomas Wyatt" and "The Disenchantment of the Elizabethans"; and in an Appendix the fragment of "The Court of Venus," now in the possession of the Folger Library. The paper on "Sir Thomas Wyatt" is a careful re-examination of the data bearing upon the poet's life and the extant poetry. Students of Wyatt will be especially interested in the suggestion that the metrical irregularities of the early sonnets result from the fact that they were "mere exercises in translation or adaptation, roughly jotted down in whatever broken rhythms came readiest to hand, and intended perhaps for subsequent polishing at some time of leisure which never presented itself." Rather convincing is the organization of evidence to uphold the traditional theory that Wyatt and Anna Boleyn were at one time intimate, and a fresh biographical contribution is made in the conclusive evidence that Elizabeth Darrell was the mistress of Wyatt's latest years, and perhaps the Phillis of his poetry. "The Disenchantment of the Elizabethans" will fascinate all students of the period. While recognizing the large degree of truth in the traditional concept of Elizabethanism as "sensuous, comprehensive, extravagant, disorderly, thirsty for beauty, abounding in the zest of life," Sir Edmund aims to present the other side of the picture, "the instability of human reckonings" as reflected in Samuel Daniel's verse, the "sense of the fleetingness of all worldly goods" which haunts the verse of Robert Southwell, written always "in the imminent shadow of death," and the "note of disillusion" which is "a constant undersong in the full strain of court poetry itself." The essays in this volume are scholarship at its best, combining as they do scientific thoroughness with refined appreciation of literary values, and couched in prose that is fluent and delicately exact.

FREDERICK MORGAN PADEL FORD

University of Washington

The City-Madam A Comedy By Philip Massinger. Edited by RUDOLF KIRK. Princeton: University Press, 1934. Pp. x + 184. \$2.00. The chief contribution of this volume is an account of the stage history of *The City Madam*, its imitations and adaptations. A more detailed discussion of the merits of the play would have been welcome. Luke, one of the greatest hypocrites before *Tartuffe*, really deserves fuller treatment. The loose ends referred to (p. 55 and note 157) may have resulted from tampering with the MS after it left the author's hands (probably about 1624-6, as Mr. Kirk thinks). Lord Lacie's financial condition is referred to in many places (I, i, 54; I, ii, 39 ff.; II, iii, 40, for instance) and should not cause surprise. Luke's plot does, however, need elucidation. Mr. Kirk has identified the printer as Jane Bell and has accumulated some very interesting information about the publisher, Andrew Pennyucicke, and his patrons. I find it difficult to agree that the Bodleian copy dedicated to John Wrath was necessarily "the first one to come off the press" and that "its patron was the one who first had the honor of receiving this comedy of Massinger" (pp. 12-3). Eleven of the dozen or more errors peculiar to this copy occur in the inner form of signature G, which is obviously in an uncorrected state. It can hardly be more than coincidence that only one copy with this dedication and this uncorrected form has come to public attention. In a casual examination of several copies of the quarto I have noted a difference in watermarks not mentioned by Mr. Kirk (the reference on p. 6 should be to numbers 170 to 175). Sheet C in the Bridgewater copy in the Library of Congress has a large circular watermark, as do sheets C and H in British Museum copy 11775. bb. 21. Collation of two gatherings with the Library of Congress copy reveals a few differences: I, i, 60 reads "Me thinks"; 94, "Featur'd"; 104, "Chicken."; 113, "lowsie."; 124, "withall duty"; IV, iv, 157, "rellishes"; V, i, 23, "an Atome"; 43, "fit fort his" (this explains "for his" in C and M); 113, "soveraignty." At IV, iii, 11, the spelling is "compulsion." The editor is probably wise to ignore the frequent interchange of Roman and italic capital letters, but would it not be a good idea to capitalize the initial letter in every line and record the change in the variants?

JAMES G. McMANAWAY

The Johns Hopkins University

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

Balch, M. (ed.).—Modern Short Biographies. *New York*: Harcourt, Brace, 1935. Pp. xiv + 383. \$1.40.

Bateson, F. W.—English poetry and the English language. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford U. Press], 1934. Pp. viii + 129. \$2.25.

Boll, T. E. M.—Works of Edwin Pugh (1874-1930). *Philadelphia*: 1934. Pp. 104. (U. of Penn. diss.)

Cambiaire, C. P. (ed.).—East Tennessee and Western Virginia mountain ballads. *London*: Mitre Press, n. d. Pp. xiv + 179.

Cooper, Lane.—Aristotle, Galileo, and the Tower of Pisa. *Ithaca, New York*: Cornell U. Press [London: Humphrey Milford], 1935. Pp. 102. \$1.50.

Fowler, E. B.—Spenser and the system of courtly love. *Louisville, Kentucky*: Standard Printing Co., 1934. Pp. 91.

Goldman, M. S.—Sir Philip Sidney and the Arcadia. *Urbana*: U. of Illinois Press, 1934. Pp. 236. \$2.25. (Illinois Studies in Lang. and Lit., XVII, nos. 1-2.)

Harvey-Jellie, W.—Théâtre classique en Angleterre, dans l'âge de John Dryden. *Montréal*: Beauchemin Limitée, 1935. Pp. 109.

Hornbeak, Katherine G.—Complete letter-writer in English, 1568-1800. *Northampton*: Smith College, 1934. Pp. xii + 150. (Smith College Studies in Modern Lang., XV, nos. 3-4.)

Jenkins, Harold.—Life and work of Henry Chettle. *London*: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1934. Pp. viii + 276. 12/6.

Law, M. H.—English familiar essay in the early 19th century. *Philadelphia*: 1934. Pp. 238. (U. of Penn. diss.)

Olivero, F.—Francis Thompson. *Brescia*: Morcelliana, 1935. Pp. 281.

Simmons, E. J.—English literature and culture in Russia (1553-1840). *Cambridge*: Harvard U. Press [London: Humphrey Milford], 1935. Pp. xii + 357. \$3.50. (Harvard Studies in Comparative Lit., 12.)

Smollett, Tobias.—An essay on the external use of water. Edited by Claude E. Jones. *Baltimore*: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1935. Pp. 31-82. (Reprinted from *Bulletin of the Institute of the History of Medicine*, III.)

White, H. O.—Plagiarism and imitation during the English Renaissance. *Cambridge*:

Harvard U. Press [London: Humphrey Milford], 1935. Pp. xii + 209. \$2.50. (Harvard Studies in Eng., XII.)

Willcock, G. D.—Shakespeare as critic of language. *London*: Humphrey Milford [New York: Oxford U. Press], 1934. Pp. 30. \$0.70. (Shakespeare Association.)

Wright, Elizabeth M.—The story of Joseph Wright. *London* [and *New York*]: Oxford U. Press, 1934. Pp. xiii + 279. \$2.00.

Young, G. M. (ed.).—Early Victorian England, 1830-1865. 2 vol. *London*: [New York:] Oxford U. Press, 1934. Pp. xxvi + 414; viii + 558. \$14.00.

GERMAN

Bayer, Albert.—Der Reim von Stammsilbe auf Endsilbe im Frühmittelhochdeutschen und seine Bedeutung für die sprachliche und die literarische Chronologie. Diss. Tübingen. *Schramberg*: Gatzert & Hahn, 1934. ix, 140 pp.

Bayerschmidt, Carl F.—A Middle Low German Book of Kings. From a manuscript in the Lübeck Municipal Library. *New York*: G. E. Stechert & Co., 1934. lviii, 269 pp.

Becher, Hubert, S. J.—Germanisches Heidentum und christlicher Geist. Die Auseinandersetzung von Heidentum u. Christentum in der Literatur der germanischen Frühzeit. *Freiburg*: Herder, 1934. vii, 81 p. M. 2.20.

Bickel, Otto H.—Die Flurnamen von Rinklingen. [Badische Flurnamen. Bd. 1, Hft. 5]. *Heidelberg*: Winter. 40 pp., 1 Map. M. 2.50.

Bongs, Rolf.—Die Wertung und Geltung Kleists zur Zeit der Romantik. [Sammlung Heitz. Reihe 10, Bd. 2]. *Leipzig*: Heitz & Cie., 1934. 79 pp. 4°. M. 3.

Casper, Siegfried.—Der Dramatiker Hanns Johst. *München*: Albert Langen, 1935. 28 pp. M. 1.

Doenhardt, Schwester Willibaldis.—Lesung und Corneille. Diss. *Münster*: Helios-Verl. [1934]. 94 pp.

Duden, Der grosse. 1: Rechtsschreibung der deutschen Sprache u. d. Fremdwörter . . . hrsg. von Otto Basler. 11 Aufl. 2: Stilwörterbuch der deutschen Sprache . . . von Otto Basler u. Ewald Geißler. *Leipzig*: Bibliogr. Institut [1934]. 1: 61, 669 pp., M. 4. 2: 16, 694 pp., M. 4.

Engel, Carlo.—Studien zum Dichterbegriff und zur poetischen Anschauung der Heidelberger Romantiker. Diss. Frankfurt. *Würzburg*: Triltsch, 1934. 92 pp. M. 3.

Erckmann, Rudolf.—Der Einfluss der arabisch-spanischen Kultur auf die Entwicklung des Minnesangs. Diss. *Giessen*: 1933. 43 pp.

Falkner, Ernst.—Wiguleus Hundt und seine Sprache im "Bayrischen Stammbuch." Ein Beitrag zur bayerischen Geschichte u. Sprache d. 16. Jh. [Südostbayerische Heimatstudien. Bd. 7]. Tl. 1. *Hirschenhausen*: Jos. Weber, 1934. xii, 63 pp. M. 1.50.

Färber, Elisabeth.—Höfisches und "Spielmännisches" im Rolandslied des Pfaffen Konrad. (Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Klärung der Beziehungen zwischen Kaiserchronik und Rolandslied). Diss. *Erlangen*: Krahel, 1934. iv, 81 pp.

Frels, Wilhelm.—Deutsche Dichterhandschriften von 1400 bis 1900. Gesamtkatalog der eigenhändigen Hss. deutscher Dichter in den Bibliotheken und Archiven Deutschlands, Österreichs, der Schweiz u. der CSR. [Bibliographical Publications. Germanic Section, Mod. Lang. Association of America. Vol. 2]. *Leipzig*: Hiersemann, 1934. xiv, 382 pp. 4°. M. 45.

—Goetheschrifttum des Goethejahres. Deutschsprachige Bücher und Aufsätze des Jahres 1932 [Cento-Druck. 7]. *Weimar*: Duncker, 1934. 108 pp. 4°. (100 copies). M. 36.

Gauss, Julia.—Die methodische Grundlage von Goethes Geschichtsforschung. (Diss. *Basel*). [S.-A. aus Jahrb. d. Freien Deutschen Hochstifts, 1933]. *Ansbach*: Brügel, 1934. 124 pp.

Gontard, Susette.—Die Briefe der Diotima (Susette Gontard an Hölderlin). Hrsg. von Karl Viëtor. [Insel-Bücherei. Nr. 455]. *Leipzig*: Insel-Verlag [1934]. 79 pp. 80 Pf.

Grisson, Rudolf.—Herrscherdämmerung und Deutschlands Erwachen in Wagners "Ring des Nibelungen." *Leipzig*: Adolf Klein, 1934. 214 pp. M. 4.80.

Günther, Irmgard.—Die Einwirkung des skandinavischen Romans auf den deutschen Naturalismus. (Diss. *Giessen*). [Nordische Studien. 14]. *Greifswald*: Bamberg, 1934. 158 pp. M. 4.

Guttmann, Erich.—Die deutsche romantische Musikerzählung nach E. T. A. Hoffmann. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des historisch-biographischen Künstlerromans und der Künstlernovelle in Deutschland. Diss. *Breslau*: 1934. ii, 47 pp.

Hartmannshenn, Herta.—Jean Pauls "Titan" und die Romane Fr. H. Jacobis. Diss. *Marburg*: Bauer, 1934. iv, 77 pp.

Henrici, Irmgard.—Friedrich Otte ein elsässischer Dichter. Diss. *München*. *Aachen*: Aachener Verl.- u. Druckerei-Ges., 1934. 59 pp.

Herrmann, Hans.—Der Gegenwärtigkeitsgedanke in der theoretischen Behandlung des dramatischen Kunstwerks bei Lessing, A. W. Schlegel und Hegel. [Sprache u. Kultur der germanischen u. romanischen Völker.

B, Bd. 8]. *Breslau*: Priebatsch, 1934. viii, 72 pp. M. 3.20.

Hohe Lied, Das St. Trudperter. Kritische Ausgabe, Text, Wörterverzeichnis und Anmerkungen von Hermann Menhardt [Rheinische Beiträge und Hilfsbücher zur germanischen Philologie u. Volkskunde. Bd. 22]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1934. Pp. vii, 123-307. M. 8.

Huober, Hans-Günther.—Zinzendorfs Kirchenliederdichtung. Untersuchung über das Verhältnis von Erlebnis und Sprachform. [Germanische Studien, H. 150]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1934. 86 pp. M. 3.60.

Jagenlauf, Franz.—August Wilhelm von Schlegel und die Lehre vom Verstehen. Diss. *Leipzig*: 1934. vi, 123 pp.

Kaschmieder, Käthe.—David Fassmanns "Gespräche im Reiche der Toten" (1718-1740). Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Geistes- und Kulturgeschichte des 18. Jh. Diss. *Breslau*: [Lützow-Druckerei] 1934. 67 pp.

Keienburg, Margarete.—Studien zur Wortstellung bei Predigern des 13. u. 14. Jh. sowie bei Johannes von Saaz. Diss. Teildruck. *Köln*: 1934. 45 pp.

Kisch, Gustav.—Reflexe romanisch-germanischer Kulturberührungen im Wortschatze des Gotischen und Rumänischen. [S.-A. aus Festschrift D. Dr. Friedrich Tentsch, 1931]. *Hermannstadt*: Honterus-Buchdruckerei, 1931. 32 pp.

Kohnle, Eduard Hans.—Studien zu den Ordnungsgrundsätzen mittelhochdeutscher Liederhandschriften. (Die Folge der Lieder in A und E). Mit einem Anhang: Der Verfasser der sogenannten jungen Spervogelstrophen A 27-30. [Tübinger germ. Arbeiten. Bd. 20]. *Stuttgart*: Kohlhammer [1934]. 152 pp. M. 9.

Kretschmar, Eberhard.—Rilke als Dichter des Seins. Diss. *Dresden*: Risse-Verlag, 1934. 88 pp. M. 3.

Kröplin, Karl Heinz.—Klopstocks Hermannsdramen in theatergeschichtlicher und dramaturgischer Beleuchtung. Diss. *Rostock*. *Güstrow i. Meckl.*: Boy, 1934. 86 pp.

Kummer, Rolf.—Die Frankfurter Berichte Gustavs von Meyern-Hohenberg. (Mit einem Lebensbild und einer Würdigung seines literarischen Schaffens). Diss. *München*. *Leipzig*: Gebr. Gerhardt, 1934. xi, 108 pp.

Küpper, Heinz.—Französische Nibelungenforschung. Eine Studie zur französischen Germanistik und Literaturkritik. Diss. Teildruck. *Köln*: Gutenberg-Druckerei, 1934. 69 pp.

Kynass, Fritz.—Der Jude im deutschen Volkslied. Eine Teilstudie. Diss. *Greifswald*: Adler, 1934. 155 pp.

Ladewig, Paul.—Dantes Vita Nova bei

Goethe. *Darmstadt*: Ernst Ludwig Presse, 1934. 25 pp. 4°. M. 2.

Lich, Walter.—Klopstocks Dichterbegriff. Diss. Frankfurt. *Düren*: [Jünemann] 1934. 67 pp.

Ludwig.—Otto-Ludwig-Kalender. Jahrbuch des Otto-Ludwig-Vereins. Hrag. von Wilh. Greiner. Jg. 7. 1935. *Weimar*: Böhlau [1934]. 120 pp. M. 2.

Markus, Andreas.—Der Tod Adalbert Stifters. [Germanische Studien. H. 154]. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1934. 90 pp. M. 3.60.

Meyer, Anton.—Die Flurnamen der Gemarkungen Girkelsrath, Golzheim und Merzenich. [Beiträge zur rheinischen und westfälischen Volkskunde in Einzeldarstellungen. H. 9]. *Wuppertal-Elberfeld*: Martini & Grüttesien, 1934. viii, 97 pp. M. 4.

Meyer, Hermann.—Die alten Namen der Gemarkungen Waldmichelbach und Aschbach im Odenwald. Diss. *Giessen*: 1934. 67 pp. 1 Map.

Müller, Günther.—Deutsches Dichten und Denken vom Mittelalter bis zur Neuzeit (Deutsche Literaturgeschichte von 1270 bis 1700). [Sammlung Göschen. 1086]. *Berlin*: de Gruyter, 1934. 159 pp. M. 1.62.

Müller, Joachim.—Grillparzers Menschenauffassung [Literatur und Leben. Bd. 4]. *Weimar*: Böhlau, 1934. ix, 156 pp. M. 5.

Oehl, Wilhelm.—Das Lallwort in der Sprachschöpfung. Rede. *Freiburg, Schweiz*: 1933. iv, 48 pp.

Paul, Hermann.—Deutsches Wörterbuch. 4. Aufl. von Karl Euling. Lieferung 6. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1934. Pp. 401-480. M. 2.

Petsch, Robert.—Wesen und Formen der Erzählkunst. [Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift f. Literaturwissenschaft, Buchreihe. Bd. 20]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1934. xiv, 346 pp. M. 11.

Pohl, Erich.—Die deutsche Volksballade von der Losgekauften. Ein Versuch zur Erforschung des Ursprungs und Werdeganges einer Volksballade von europäischer Verbreitung. Diss. *Königsberg*. [FF Communications. No. 105]. *Helsingfors*: 1934. 361 pp.

Reichardt, Günther.—Die innere Form der Romanzen vom Rosenkranz von Clemens Brentano. Erkenntnisse zum romantischen Formvillen. Diss. *Breslau*. *Freiburg i. Schl.*: Heiber, 1934. 125 pp.

Reu, M.—Luther's German Bible. An Historical Presentation Together with a Collection of Sources. *Columbus, O.*: The Lutheran Book Concern, 1934. xiv, 364, 226 pp., 14 plates. \$4.00.

Rietschel, Olga.—Der Mönch in der Dichtung des 18. Jhs. (einschliesslich der Romantik). Diss. *Leipzig*. *Würzburg*: Triltsch, 1934. viii, 86 pp.

Rothschild, Jacob.—Kain und Abel in der deutschen Literatur. Diss. *Frankfurt. Würzburg*: Handelsdruckerei, 1933. 151 pp.

Ruschke, Franz.—Der Stammbaum unserer Muttersprache mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Lautwandlungen. Mit einer Tafel: Der Stammbaum unserer Muttersprache. *Berlin*: Deu. Sprachverein, 1934. viii, 47 pp. M. 1.80.

Schall, Josef.—Das tragische Weltbild Ferdinand von Saars. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung in Österreich. Diss. *Köln* [Auszug]. *Kallmünz*: Lassleben, 1934. 52 pp.

Schönberger, Wilhelm.—Die Sprachverhältnisse der Tirol-Salzburg-Bayerischen Länderecke. [S.-A. aus Teuthonista. Jg. 10, 1934, H. 1/2]. *Gräfenhainichen*: Heine, 1934. 68 pp.

Selchow, Bogislav von.—Das Namenbuch. Eine Sammlung sämtlichen deutscher, altdeutscher, und in Deutschland gebräuchlicher fremdländischer Vornamen mit Angabe ihrer Abstammung und ihrer Deutung. *Leipzig*: K. F. Koehler [1934]. 175 pp. M. 2.80.

Semela, Kurt.—Frauen-Erleben und Frauen-Gestalten bei Heinrich von Kleist. Diss. *Berlin*: Brandel, 1934. 79 pp.

Skalitzky, Sepp.—Christian Heinrich Spiess. Ein Schauerdichter und sein Schicksal. [Sammlung gemeinnütziger Vorträge. Nr. 662/663]. *Reichenberg*: Stiepel, 1934. 31 pp. Kē. 4.50.

Stoltenberg, Hans L.—Der eigendutsche Wortschatz der Weisheitslehre in der Entwicklung seiner Stände. *Frankfurt a. M.*: Diesterweg, 1934. 283 pp. M. 10.

Stone, Ruth.—Studien über den deutschen Einfluss auf das amerikanische Englisch. Diss. *Marburg*. *Bochum*: Pöppinghaus, 1934. vii, 90 pp.

Strobel, Hans.—Die Flurnamen von Heinersreuth. Ein Beitrag zur ostfränkischen Volkskunde. [Fränkische Forschungen. 4]. *Erlangen*: Palm & Enke, 1934. viii, 112 pp. 4 plates. M. 5.50.

Teske, Hans.—Walther von der Vogelweide, der Sänger des Deutschen Reiches. [Colemans kleine Biographien. H. 49]. *Lübeck*: Coleman, 1934. 46 pp. 70 Pf.

Ullrich, Johann.—Heinrich Laubes politischer Entwicklungsgang bis zum Jahre 1834. Diss. Teildruck. *Berlin*: 1934. 56 pp.

Wiehe, Erika.—Gottlieb Mohnike als Vermittler und Übersetzer nordischer Literatur [Nordische Studien. 15]. *Greifswald*: Bamberg, 1934. 123 pp.

Wolfskehl, Marie-Luise.—Die Jesusminne in der Lyrik des deutschen Barok. Diss. *Giessen*. [Giessener Beiträge zur deutschen

Philologie. Bd. 34]. *Giessen*: v. Münchow, 1934. 182 pp.

Wood, Frank H. Jr.—Heine as a Critic of his own Works. *New York*: Stechert & Co., 1934. 182 pp.

FRENCH

Baskervill, C. R. — Pierre Gringore's Pageants for the Entry of Mary Tudor into Paris. *Chicago*: U. of Chicago Press, 1934. xxxii + 43 pp. \$1.50.

Becker, Ph. A.—Der gepaarte Achtsilber in der franz. Dichtung. *Leipzig*: Hirzel, 1934. 117 pp.

Belleli, M. L.—Modernità di Montaigne. *Rome*: Formiggini, 1934. 197 pp.

Belowski. — Lukrez in der französischen Literatur der Renaissance. *Berlin*: Ebering, 1934. 132 pp.

Berger, A.—Der Ausdruck der passivischen Idee im Altfranzösischen. *Jena und Leipzig*: Gronau, 1934. 77 pp.

Bergmann, J. — Die Provence und die Provenzen in der Schilderung Daudets. *Münster*: Rom. Sem., 1934. 49 pp.

Binswanger, P.—Die ästhetische Problematik Flauberts. *Frankfurt*: Klostermann, 1934. 183 pp.

Björkenheim, M. — P. Loti och havet. *Helsingfors*: Söderström, 1934. 146 pp.

Boileau.—Satires, éd. J. Griveaud. *Paris*: Delagrave, 1934. 156 pp. Fr. 5.

Boulan, H. R. — Les mots d'origine étrangère en fr. (1650-1700). *Groningen*: Academisch proefschrift, 1934. 229 pp.

Braun, E.—Die Stellung des Dichters P. Corneille zu den "Remarques" des Grammatikers Vaugelas. Diss. *Munich*: 1934. 55 pp.

Casnati, F.—I drammi cristiani di Claudel. *Milan*: Soc. ed. Vita e pensiero, 1934. vii + 218 pp.

— Proust. *Brescia*: Morcelliana, 1934. xi + 149 pp.

Charroi de Nîmes, altfranzösisches Epos, Hs D, herausgeg. von E. Lange-Kowal. *Berlin*: Collignon, 1934. 77 pp.

Corneille.—Cinna, ed. L. M. Riddle. *New York*: Appleton-Century, 1934. xlviii + 183 pp. \$1.25.

Costenoble, H. N., and Armstrong, L. E.—Studies in Fr. Intonation. *Cambridge*: Heffner, 1934. xvi + 278 pp. 10 s. 6 d.

Dane, Ivo.—Die symbolische Gestaltung in der Dichtung Flauberts. Diss. *Cologne*: 1934. 117 pp.

Daude de Pradas.—Poésies, éd. A. H. Schutz. *Paris*: Didier, 1933. xxxvi + 107 pp. (Bibl. Mérid.)

Fabry, M.—Lectures wallonnes. *Liège*:

Eds. du Musée de la vie wallonne, 1934. 39 pp.

Françon, M.—Albums poétiques de Marguerite d'Autriche. *Cambridge*: Harvard Univ. Press, 1934. 300 pp.

Gmelin, H.—Französische Geistesform in Sainte-Beuve, Renard und Taine. *Berlin*: Junker & Dünhaupt, 1934. 103 pp.

Günther, H.—Die Sprache des Königs Karl VIII von Frankreich. Diss. *Jena*: 1934. 73 pp.

Gurgo, B.—Mme de Staël. *Naples*: Coop. edit. Libreria, 1934. 231 pp.

Haas, E.—Flaubert und die Politik. Diss. *Heidelberg*: 1934. 99 pp.

Hahnel, K.—Sprachl. Untersuchungen zur Alexius-Handschrift V. Diss. *Jena*: 1934. 66 pp.

Heinermann, Th.—Grundlagen der phonativen Hervorhebung des Französischen. *Leipzig*: Velhagen u. Klasing, 1934. 94 pp.

Hengstler, A.—Geistlicher, Mönch und Nonne im Spiegel der volkstümlichen romanischen Namengebung. Diss. *Tübingen*: 1934. 95 pp.

Henke, O. — Grammatikalischer Kommentar zu Bousquet, Comtes consulaires de Rodez. *Leipzig*: Gronau, 1934. viii + 76 pp.

Hirschberger, T.—Die drei Fassungen von Claudels "Annonce faite à Marie." *Breslau*: Franke, 1934. 212 pp.

Karpa, L. — Themen der französischen Lyrik im 17. Jh. Diss. *Bonn*: 1934. 187 pp.

Kneer, G.—Das Familienproblem in Zolas Rougon-Macquart. *Wertheim*: Bechstein, 1934. 76 pp.

Kransfelder, H. R. — Die Hirtendichtung und die dramatischen Pastoralen A. Hardys. Diss. *Munich*: 1934. 51 pp.

Kruse, H.—Sach- u. Wortkundliches aus den südfranzösischen Alpen, Verdon-, Vaire-, u. Vartal. *Hamburg*: Sem. für rom. Sprachen u. Kultur, 1934. x + 82 pp.

Lhérisson, F.—Mme Lafarge, écrivain romantique. *Paris*: Edit. Delmas, 1934. 150 pp. Fr. 12.

Loch, Ph.—Ch. Sorel als literarischer Kritiker. Diss. *Munich*: 1934. ix + 70 pp.

Lugli, V. — Due Francesi: Flaubert, Chénier. *Florence*: Le Monnier, 1934. 442 pp.

Mayeur, le, ruiné par sa charge, comédie wallonne inédite, publ. par J. Haust. *Liège*: Vaillant-Carmanne, 1934. 85 pp.

Melang, W.—Flaubert als Begründer des literarischen Impressionismus in Frankreich. Diss. *Münster*: 1933. v + 91 pp.

Neumüller, J.—Fontenelles Stil im Lichte der Satz-verknüpfung. Diss. *Munich*: 1934. 92 pp.

Pearce, G. R.—Dumas père. *London: Duckworth, 1934. 143 pp.*

Rauch, F.—Das Verhältnis der "Evangeliien" E. Zolas zu dessen früheren Werken. Diss. *Erlangen: 1934. 88 pp.*

Richter, K.—Fr. de Curel. Diss. *Leipzig: 1934. 95 pp.*

Röder, J.—Das Fürstenbild in den mittelalterlichen Fürstenspiegeln auf französischen Boden. Diss. *Münster: 1933. 98 pp.*

Rosenberg, R.—Zur künstlerischen Entwicklung des Philippe de Champaigne. Diss. *Munich: 1934. 47 pp.*

Schmidt, M.—Formen der Angst bei Villiers de l'Isle-Adam. Diss. *Zurich: 1934. 152 pp.*

Schulz, A.—Die Sprachkunst Th. Gautiers. Diss. *Münster: 1934. 68 pp.*

Toole, R.—Wortgeschichtliche Studien: *tonpin und bronze. Jena und Leipzig: Gronau, 1934. 78 pp.*

Voretzsch, K.—Lyrische Auswahl aus der Felihtredichtung. I. Texte. *Halle: Niemeyer, 1934.*

Weber, H.—Die Personennamen in Rodez um die Mitte des XIV Jh. *Leipzig: Gronau, 1934. ix + 90 pp.*

Weber, J.—J. Moréas und die franz. Tradition. Diss. *Erlangen: 1934. xi + 115 pp.*

Weinert, H.—Dichtung aus dem Glauben (Renouveau catholique in Frankreich). *Hamburg: Sem. für rom. Sprachen u. Kultur, 1934. vii + 221 pp.*

Weise, Ch.—Huysmans Beziehungen zur Malerei. Diss. *Jena: 1934. 80 pp.*

ITALIAN

Alfieri, Vittorio.—Saul. Filippo. Tragedie. Con introduzione di A. Farinelli. *Torino: G. P. Paravia, 1933. xxvii + 99 pp. L. 4.50.* (Biblioteca di classici italiani.)

Antona Traversi, C.—Vita di Gabriele D'Annunzio. *Firenze: A. Vallecchi, 1933. 2 vols., 345, 321 pp. L. 3 each volume.* (Biblioteca Vallecchi. Letteratura italiana e straniera, n. 42¹ e 42².)

Ariosto, Ludovico.—Orlando furioso. Edizione integra. Introduzione, testo, argomenti, indice copiosissimo a cura di N. Zingarelli. *Milano: U. Hoepli, 1934. lxxv + 600 pp. L. 28.*

Aurelio, A.—Uomini, leggende e canti di Dalmazia. *Roma: Biblioteca editrice, 1934. 61 pp. L. 3.* (Collana dei gioielli italiani.)

Avenati, C. A.—La rivoluzione italiana da Vittorio Alfieri a Benito Mussolini. *Torino: G. B. Paravia e C., 1934. 497 pp. L. 18.*

Bandello, Matteo.—Quaranta novelle scelte da — aggiuntivi Giulietta e Romeo di Luigi

da Porto, riprodotte sulle edizioni originali del secolo XVI, col corredo di cenni bibliografici, note, indice onomastico a cura di F. Picco. *Milano: Sonzogno, 1933. 396 pp. L. 4.* (Biblioteca classica economica, n. 121.)

Barbi, M.—Problemi di critica dantesca. Prima serie (1893-1918). *Firenze: G. C. Sansoni, 1934. xi + 481 pp. L. 40.*

Battistrada, M.—Rievocazioni. Il canzoniere amoroso di una gentildonna. La poesia di Vittorio Locchi. Un eroe ascolano della Gerusalemme liberata. Giulio Cantalamezza. *Ascoli Piceno: G. Cesari, 1933. 107 pp. L. 3.*

Beltrani, P.—Alfredo Oriani ed alcune lettere di Antonio Fogazzaro e di Giulio Cesare Abba. Studi letterari di P. G. A cura di D. Beltrani. *Faenza: Soc. tip. Faentina, 1934. 22 pp.*

Bernini, F., e Bianchi, L.—Giosuè Carducci, Giovanni Pascoli, e Gabriele D'Annunzio. Antologia poetica per uso delle scuole medie a cura e con note di —. *Bologna: N. Zanichelli, 1933. 252 pp. L. 10.*

Bertani, C.—Gli immortali. Lezioni di letteratura italiana con antologia sistematica degli autori per i r. istituti tecnici superiori e le altre scuole medie superiori. Vol. I: parte I e II; vol. II: parte I e II. *Alessandria: G. Colombani e C., 1933. 4 vols., 478, 569, 575, 535. L. 18; 20; 20; 18.*

Bocchi, F.—Nuova sintesi della letteratura nazionale. *Modena: Guanda, 1934. 96 pp. L. 7.*

Boffito, G.—Scrittori barnabiti o della congregazione dei chierici regolari di San Paolo; 1533-1933. Biografia, bibliografia, iconografia. III: N-S. *Firenze: L. S. Olschki, 1934. 580 pp.*

Borgese, G. A.—Poetica dell'unità. Cinque saggi. *Milano: F.lli Treves, 1934. xxvii + 283 pp. L. 12.*

Borsi, G.—Colloqui. A cura di G. Berzero. *Milano: F.lli Treves, 1933. xxiii + 291 pp. L. 15.*

Bozzoni, R.—Sulle espressioni "natura," "naturalis," "naturaliter." *Napoli: N. Jovene e C., 1933. 25 pp. L. 3.*

Bruzzone, Pellegrina.—I maestri di un' "arte perigliosa." Poeti estemporanei del '700. *Genova-Sampierdarena: Scuola tip. Don Bosco, 1933. 32 pp.*

Buonarroti, Michelangelo.—Lettere e rime. Scelta, prefazione e commento di Marialuisa Gengaro. *Milano: A. Vallardi, 1933. 124 pp. L. 3.* (I grandi scrittori.)

Calandrino, I.—Con la penna e con la spada. Saggi critici e polemici. *Roma: Ediz. di "Momento," 1934. 129 pp. L. 6.*

Campagnoli, A.—Bologna intellettuale. *Bologna*: Officine graf. combattenti, 1933. 186 pp.

Capasso, A.—Nota sul "genere" lirico, con una nota polemica. *Genova*: E. Degli Orfini, 1933. 39 pp. L. 3.50. (I quaderni bianchi, n. 1.)

Caucci, Cesira.—Il codice vaticano-rossiano 651 (X-32) e le laudi autentiche del Bianco da Siena. *Pistoia*: Arte della stampa, 1934. 30 pp.

Cecchini, A.—Serafino Aquilano e l'influenza della lirica italiana sulla lirica inglese del '500. *Aquila*: Tip. Bodoniana, 1934. 100 pp.

Celebrazioni di Romagna: Cesare, Dante, Carducci, Pascoli. *Roma*: Confederazione nazionale Sindacati fascisti professionisti e artisti, 1933. 323 pp. L. 12.

Consiglio, A.—Studi di poesia. *Firenze*: "Solaria," 1934. 229 pp. L. 15.

D'Alessandro, A.—Cesare Della Valle, duca di Ventignano, e le sue tragedie. *Palermo*: Tip. S. Fameli, 1934. 79 pp. L. 7.

Damerini, G.—Tommaseo amico e nemico di Carrer. Con lettere e documenti inediti. *Venezia*: Tip. Ommassini e Pascon, 1934. 110 pp. L. 10.

D'Ancona, A., e Bacci, O.—Manuale della letteratura italiana riordinato e annotato pei licei da M. Sterzi. Vol. III, parte I e II. *Firenze*: G. Barbèra, 1933-1934. 2 vols., 678, 1256 pp. L. 12; 18. (Collezione scolastica Barbèra.)

De Sanctis, F.—Pagine sparse. Contributi alla sua biografia e supplemento alla bibliografia (di B. Croce, E. Cione, C. Muscetta), a cura di B. Croce. *Bari*: G. Laterza, 1934. 150 pp. L. 10. (Biblioteca di cultura moderna, n. 247.)

Donati, L.—Pascoli, Papini . . . io! *Bologna*: Ed. La Vigna, 1934. 204 pp. L. 10.

D'Ovidio, F.—Varietà filologiche. Scritti di filologia classica e di lingua italiana. *Napoli*: A. Guida, 1934. viii + 315 pp. L. 25. (Opere, X.)

Duprè Theseider, E.—Il problema critico delle lettere di Santa Caterina da Siena. *Roma*: Tip. del Senato di G. Bardi, 1933. 164 pp. (Repr. fr. the "Bullettino dell'Istituto storico italiano e Archivio muratoriano," n. 49.)

Fallacara, L.—Antologia. Scelta e introduzione di A. Capasso. Prosa e poesia. *Genova*: E. Degli Orfini, 1934. 111 pp. L. 9. (Collezione degli scrittori nuovi, diretta da A. Capasso, n. 11.)

Fatini, G.—Le Rime di Ludovico Ariosto. *Torino*: G. Chiantore, 1934. 254 pp. L. 48. (Giornale storico della letteratura italiana, Supplemento, n. 25.)

Fenizia, Carmela.—Berardino Rota, poeta napoletano. Studio critico. *Napoli*: Tip. A. Nappa, 1933. 75 pp.

Fogazzaro, Antonio.—Piccolo mondo antico. Edizione a cura di P. Nardi. *Milano-Verona*: A. Mondadori, 1934. 483 pp. L. 10.

Gandolfo, A.—Puntare sul presente. Saggi di letteratura. *Catania*: Studio editor. moderno, 1934. 135 pp. L. 7.

Gastaldi, M.—Il "Saluto alla terra rifioriente" dei due Orsini. Diritti e rovesci di un'Accademia di poesia. *Milano-Como*: "Quaderni di poesia" di E. Cavalleri, 1933. 35 pp. L. 2.50.

Gianelli, Giulio.—Poesie. Con la vita del poeta di O. Castellino. *Torino*: Soc. edit. internazionale, 1934. 215 pp. L. 12.

Giaresu, A.—Vincenzo Monti. Saggio di letteratura comparata. *Roma*: P. Maglione, 1933. 58 pp. L. 4.

Girardelli, Teresa.—Pietro Borsieri patriota e letterato. *Como*: E. Cavalleri, 1934. 141 pp.

Giuliani, S.—Interviste. Prefazione di G. Brunati. *Milano*: Tip. del "Popolo d'Italia," 1934. x + 101 pp. L. 10.

Giuliano, Maria Luisa.—Cultura e attività calligrafica nel secolo XII a Verona. *Padova*: "Cedam," casa editrice dott. A. Milani, 1933. xiii + 127 pp. L. 18. (R. Università di Padova. Pubblicazioni della facoltà di lettere e filosofia, n. 5.)

Goldoni, Carlo.—La locandiera. Commedia, con introduzione e commento a cura di G. Bottoni. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1933. 80 pp. L. 3.

—La bottega del caffè. Commedia, annotata per le scuole da G. Lipparini. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1933. 87 pp. L. 3.

Guicciardini, Francesco.—Scritti politici e ricordi. A cura di R. Palmarocchi. *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1933. 391 pp. L. 30. (Scrittori d'Italia, n. 145.)

Leopardi, Giacomo.—Pensieri. (Detti memorabili di Filippo Ottonieri. Pensieri CXI. Dallo "Zibaldone.") Con introduzione, note e commento di G. Marpillero. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1934. 162 pp. L. 6. (Scrittori italiani e stranieri, n. 44.)

Lipparini, G.—Manuale di letteratura italiana per gli istituti tecnici superiori e per gli istituti nautici. Biografia, sommari storici, giudizi estetici, illustrazioni d'arte. Volume II, per la seconda classe. Gli scrittori del quattrocento e del cinquecento. Episodi del Purgatorio. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1934. 524 pp. L. 15.

Lombardi Satriani, R.—Canti popolari calabresi. A cura di —. Vol. V. *Napoli*: E. De Simone, 1934. xv + 301 pp. L. 20.

(Biblioteca delle tradizioni popolari calabresi, V.)

Lombardo, Anna. — L'opera poetica di Giuseppe Revere. Studio critico. *Catania*: Tip. F. Conti, 1934. 126 pp. L. 6.

Longo, G. — Spiriti e forme dell'Orlando furioso. Conferenza. *Bari*: Canfora e C., 1933. 43 pp. L. 5.

Manzoni, Alessandro. — I promessi sposi. Storia della colonna infame. Con l'aggiunta di un saggio della edizione del 1825 e di quindici capitoli cavati da "Gli sposi promessi" (Il ratto e la liberazione di Lucia). Testo riscontrato con le migliori stampe e con l'autografo. Con prefazione di R. Bacchelli e G. Scarpa. *Milano*: Tip. Gregoriana, 1934. xii + 1001 pp. L. 40.

Marchesini, Maria. — Saggio su Machiavelli. *Firenze*: "La nuova Italia," 1934. 155 pp. L. 8.50. (Collana critica.)

Marpicati, A. — Il dramma politico di Ugo Foscolo. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1934. 191 pp. L. 8.

Martina, M. — Antologia italiana per lo studio dei vari generi del dire nelle scuole medie superiori. *Torino*: Società editr. internazionale, 1933. 2 vols., 713, 720 pp. L. 18 each volume.

Mattalia, D. — L'opera critica di Giosuè Carducci. *Genova*: Emiliano degli Orfini, 1934. 275 pp. L. 15. (Collana della cultura diretta da L. Russo, 4.)

Mazzola, Anna Maria. — Il motivo tragico nella "Vita nuova" di Dante. Il senso della morte e la espressione del dolore in rapporto agli influssi letterari ed alle correnti religiose dell'epoca. *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1934. vii + 94 pp. L. 10.

Metastasio, Pietro (Trapassi, Pietro). — Attilio Regolo. Con introduzione e note di G. Parisi. *Milano*: L. Trevisini, 1933. 77 pp. L. 3.

Morandi, L., e Cappuccini, G. — Grammatica italiana per uso delle scuole. Volume unico: regole ed esercizi. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1933. xiii + 343 pp. L. 9.50.

Moreno, Adriana. — Sotto ogni cielo. Leggende di tutti i paesi. Prefazione di C. Berra. *Torino*: S. Lattes e C., 1934. vii + 169 pp. L. 12.

Pazzi, Gianna. — Le "Delizie estensi" e l'Ariosto. Fasti e piaceri di Ferrara nella Rinascenza. *Pescara Riviera*: N. Jecco, 1933. 4to., 281 pp. L. 50.

Pellis, U. — Versi friulani del cinquecento. Pubblicati da —. *Trieste*: Editoriale libraria, 1933. 35 pp.

Piccinni, N. — Napoli, terra di precursori. *Napoli*: "Gruppo di cultura Angiulli," 1933. 39 pp. L. 1.25.

Polcenigo, Giorgio conte Nolini da. — La lettiera precipitata. Poemetto giocoso inedito settecentesco. A cura di E. Fabbrovich. *Udine*: A. Bosetti, 1933. 30 pp.

Pontano, Giovanni. — Dai "Carmina." L'amore coniugale. I giambi. Le egloghe. La lira. Gli inni religiosi. Gli orti delle Esperidi. Testo con traduzione a fronte e introduzione di A. Gustarelli. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1934. 395 pp. L. 12. (Scrittori italiani e stranieri, 45.)

Quadrotta, G. — Scrittori e giornalisti della provincia di Frosinone. A cura di —. *Arpino*: Soc. tip. Arpinate, 1933. 116 pp. L. 5. (Quaderni della "Rassegna del Lazio," Ricognizioni, I.)

Rizzi, F. — Francesco Petrarca e il decennio parmense (1341-1351). Sotto gli auspici della Deputazione di storia patria per le provincie parmensi. *Torino*: G. B. Paravia e C., 1934. 516 pp. L. 20.

Romagnoli, E. — L'insegnamento etico ed artistico di Giosuè Carducci. Conferenza. *Bologna*: N. Zanichelli, 1933. 33 pp. L. 4.

Romeo, Giuseppe. — Le cicalate di D. Pippo Romeo, patrizio messinese (1733-1933). Edizione commemorativa del II centenario dalla nascita dell'autore, curata nel testo, nelle note e in un breve studio introduttivo da T. Saitta. *Messina*: "La Sicilia," 1933. lix + 468 pp. L. 14.

Rosina, T. — D'Annunzio e la poesia di Garibaldi. Prefazione di A. Capasso. *Genova*: E. Degli Orfini, 1934. 213 pp. L. 10. (Collezione degli scrittori nuovi, diretta da A. Capasso, n. 10.)

Russo, L. — Giovanni Verga. Nuova redazione con appendice bibliografica. *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1934. 363 pp. L. 20. (Biblioteca di cultura moderna, n. 248.)

Settembrini, Luigi. — Ricordanze della mia vita. A cura di A. Omodeo. *Bari*: G. Laterza e figli, 1934. 2 vols., 286, 325 pp. L. 50. (Scrittori d'Italia, 146-147.)

Sorbelli, A. — Inventari dei manoscritti delle biblioteche d'Italia. LV: Bassano del Grappa. *Firenze*: L. S. Olschki, 1934. 329 pp.

Titone, V. — Retorica e antiretorica nell'opera di Alfredo Oriani. *Roma*: Albrighi, Segati e C., 1934. 41 pp. L. 5.

Torraca, F. — Il canto XXVI del Purgatorio letto nella Sala di Dante in Orsanmichele. *Firenze*: G. C. Sansoni, 1932. 51 pp. L. 3.50. (Lectura Dantis.)

Vallecchi, A. — Ricordi e idee di un editore vivente. *Firenze*: A. Vallecchi, 1934. 250 pp. L. 6.

Valli, F. — L'adolescenza di S. Caterina da Siena. Esame critico delle fonti. *Siena*:

Tip. editr. S. Bernardino, 1934. 100 pp. (Biblioteca di studi cateriniani, III.)

Vanni, M.—Primo dizionario di lingua italiana ad uso delle scuole e delle famiglie, con postille dialettali e di varia enciclopedia e la guida degli accenti e delle sparse indicazioni grammaticali. *Lanciano*: G. Carabba, 1933. 670 pp. L. 15.

Verga, Giovanni.—Dal tuo al mio. Nuovissima edizione con uno studio di Lina Perroni, sulla "Attualità di Giovanni Verga." *Milano-Verona*: A. Mondadori, 1934. viii + 98 pp. L. 5. (Libri azzurri, n. 111.)

Weidlich, C.—Ritratto di Ferdinando Martini (1841-1928). *Palermo*: Casa editr. "Domino," 1934. 170 pp. L. 5.

SPANISH

Alvarez Quintero, S. y J.—Ed. by A. M. Brady. *New York*: Macmillan, 1935. xxxi + 256 pp.

Calderón.—El Alcalde de Zalamea. Ed. para bibliófilos. *Barcelona*: G. Gili, 1934. 228 pp. 250 ptas. (Eds. "La Cometa.")

Cervantes.—El Ingenioso Hidalgo Don Quijote de la Mancha in Auswahl herausgegeben von T. Heinemann. *Halle, Saale*: Max Niemeyer, 1934. 85 pp. 1.80 ms.

Contreras, A. de.—Les Aventures du Capitán . . . (1582-1633). Trad. de J. Boulenger. *Paris*: Plon, 1933. xx + 256 pp. (Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Voyages.)

Criticón, EL.—Papel volante de letras y libros, continuación del fundado por B. J. Gallardo. *Badajoz*: Imp. "La Alianza," 1934. 55 pp. 10 ptas.

Frenguelli, J.—La personalidad y la obra de Florentino Ameghino. *La Plata*: Universidad Nacional, 1934. 51 pp.

Goyanes, J.—Miguel Servet. *Madrid*: Hernando, 1933. 342 pp.

Jeschke, H.—Die generation von 1898 in Spanien. *Halle, Saale*: Max Niemeyer, 1934. vi + 106 pp.

Larra, M. J. de.—Macías. Ed. by J. H. Nunemaker and K. H. Vanderford. *New York*: Macmillan, 1935. xxxiii + 141 pp.

León, R.—El hombre nuevo. *Madrid*: Hernando, 1934. 424 pp. (Obras completas, XIV.)

Morcillo, C.—Lope de Vega, sacerdote. *Madrid*: Ed. Razón y Fe, 1934. 147 pp. 3.50 ptas.

Otros cien temas eternos de cien autores célebres. [Temas de Mateo Alemán, Balmes, Baroja, Cadalso, Cervantes, etc., y de varios escritores extranjeros.] *Barcelona*: Edit. Bauzá, 1934. 231 pp. 4 ptas.

Paz, J.—Documentos relativos a España,

existentes en los Archivos nacionales de París. Catálogo y extractos de más de dos mil documentos de los años 1276 a 1844. *Madrid*: Ed. Maestre, 1934. xii + 386 pp. 20 ptas. (Publicaciones del Instituto de Valencia de Don Juan.)

Peeters-Fontainas, J.—Bibliographie des impressions espagnoles des Pays-Bas, 1520-1799. *New York*: Institute of French Studies, 1933. xii + 345 pp.

Pérez de Urbel, J.—Los monjes españoles en la Edad Media. 2 vols. *Madrid*: Ed. Maestre, 1934. 529 y xvi + 642 pp. 40 ptas. (Publicaciones del Instituto de Valencia de Don Juan.)

Piñeyro, E.—The Romantics of Spain. Trans. with Introduction and Bibliography by E. A. Peers. *Liverpool*: Institute of Hispanic Studies, 1934. vii + 256 pp.

Rubio, D.—Classical Scholarship in Spain. *Washington*: privately printed, 1934. 205 pp.

Solana y Gutiérrez, M.—Ensayo biológico sobre Hernán Cortés. Tomo I. *Oaxaca, México*: Colección "María Bettina," 1933. xiv + 199 pp.

Tafur, Pero.—Andanças e viajes de . . . Est. prelim., glosario e índice geográfico por J. M. Ramos. *Madrid*: Hernando, 1934. xxxix + 272 pp. 4 ptas.

Unamuno, M. de.—El hermano Juan o El mundo es teatro. Vieja comedia nueva. *Madrid*: Espasa-Calpe, 1934. 205 pp. 5 ptas.

Vega, Lope de.—Cancionero teatral. Ed. y pról. por J. Robles Pazos. *Baltimore*: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1935. 114 pp. \$1.25.

Vitis, M. de.—Florilegio del parnaso americano. *Barcelona*: Maucci [1933]. 577 pp.

GENERAL

Gombel, H.—Die Fabel "vom Magen und den Gliedern" in der Weltliteratur. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1934. (ZRP, Heft 80.)

Keuck, K.—Historia. Geschichte des Wortes u. seiner Bedeutungen in der Antike u. in den romanischen Sprachen. *Emsdetten*: Lechte, 1934. ix + 122 pp.

Mélanges de philologie, d'histoire et de littérature offerts à Joseph Vianey. *Paris*: Presses univ., 1934. xvi + 513 pp.

Meyer-Lübke, W.—Die Schicksale des lateinischen l im Romanischen. *Leipzig*: Hirzel, 1934. 83 pp.

Miscellany of Studies in Romance Langs. and Lits., presented to L. E. Kastner. Ed. Mary Williams and J. A. de Rothschild. *Cambridge, Eng.*: Heffer, 1934. 576 pp.

Page, W. S.—An Introd. to colloquial Bengali. *Cambridge*: Heffer, 1934. xii + 195 pp. 10 s. 6 d. (J. G. Forlong Fund, 13.)

de
dos
844.
pp.
de

des
520-
ench

ioles
Ed.
40
de

pain.
aphy
e of

pain.
5 pp.
gico
caca,
933.

. . .
por
934.

o El
ueva.
ptas.
Ed.
ore:
pp.

maso
933].

und
alle:

des
ntike
ten:

t de
aris:

des
zig:

angs.
Ed.
hild.
p.

quial
ii +
13.)

A CRITICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY
OF THE WORKS OF
EDMUND SPENSER

PRINTED BEFORE 1700

By FRANCIS R. JOHNSON, M. A. (OXON.)

This book aims to supply the need which Spenser scholars have long felt for an adequate bibliography of the early editions of the poet's works. Such bibliographical information as has been hitherto available has been widely scattered through the introductions to the modern editions of Spenser and in the printed catalogues of important libraries and private collections; furthermore, different authorities have disagreed with respect to essential points. This work, therefore, has been based upon a new and entirely independent examination and collation of a great many different copies of the original editions themselves. About half of the extant copies of each of the editions published during Spenser's lifetime have been either examined personally by the author or collated for him by correspondents. In the case of the rarer editions this proportion has been considerably increased. Particular attention has been given to variations between different copies of the same edition, both because of their importance in connection with the determination of Spenser's text, and because they have in many cases been made the basis of an erroneous distinction between "issues."

Eleven of the most important title-pages are reproduced in facsimile. The volume is uniform in format with the new *Variorum Edition of the Works of Edmund Spenser*.

75 pages, 11 reproductions of early title pages, 7 $\frac{7}{8}$ x 10 $\frac{1}{2}$, cloth, \$2.75

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS · BALTIMORE

The Axiochus of Plato translated by
EDMUND SPENSER

Edited with an introduction by

FREDERICK MORGAN PADELDFORD

IN THE Preface to his edition of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, published in 1758, John Upton remarked, "Tis not my design to enter into any minute inquiry of his other writings; for that shall be kept for a third Volume; which will contain his Pastorals, Sonnets, etc., together with his View of the State of Ireland, and a translation of a Socratic dialogue, entitled Axiochus or of Death; which is not taken notice of by any Editor of any part of his works." Upton died two years later, and the projected volume, with its promise of the *Axiochus*, was never published. From that time to the present scholars have searched in vain for this "lost" dialogue. Recently a copy, fortunately preserved by being inlaid in a volume of the 1679 folio edition of Spenser, came into the possession of Professor Frederick Morgan Padelford. Since the announcement of the discovery at the 1932 meeting of the Modern Language Association, scholars have naturally been impatient to have access to this recovered work. The Johns Hopkins Press is now able to announce the publication of an edition of the dialogue, photographically reproduced, and edited with an introduction and notes, by Mr. Padelford.

90 pages, octavo, cloth, \$2.75

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS · BALTIMORE

For the first course in composition

THÈMES FACILES

By BERTHA S. BULLARD and M. L. CARREL

James Madison High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.

A novel type of composition and review grammar. The reading texts, on which the lessons are based, form a chronological series of brief biographies of outstanding personages of France. Each lesson consists of a well integrated program of cultural reading content, idiom study, composition and comprehension exercises, grammar review, and vocabulary acquisition and fixation. A grammatical supplement supplies all the necessary reference material.

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

Boston New York Chicago Atlanta San Francisco Dallas London

A complete and comprehensive textbook for your German classes

// ALTES UND NEUES //

by Robert O. Röseler, *University of Wisconsin* and Adelaide Ber, *Minneapolis City Schools.*

This volume offers for reading such familiar favorites as *Germelshausen*, *Immensee*, *Einer muss beiraten*; four fascinating new stories—*Die Flut des Lebens* (Stern), *Der vornehme Knabe* (Thoma), *Das Licht auf der Heide* (Löns), *Das Auge des Pferdes* (Ponten); fifteen pages of lyrics; and eight songs with music. The excellent review of grammar which is provided summarizes for the student every essential rule and practice of the German language recently taught him in his beginning grammar. The vocabulary at the back of the book covers the drill exercises as well as the reading texts proper.

List Price: \$1.36

"It was a happy thought to include both new and old stories. Perhaps what pleases me most is the quick grammar review—just what I've wanted. . . . I am thoroughly pleased with the book."

Professor Everett Skillings, *Middlebury College.*

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY

1 PARK AVENUE

NEW YORK